

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, October 19, 1993

The House met at 11 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We remember those near and dear to us, O loving God, that You would keep them in Your care and support them by Your spirit. In the quiet solitude of our own hearts we place before You the names of our family, our friends and colleagues, all those about whom we care, and we pray that You will endow them with every blessing and confer upon them the confidence of Your benediction. May each of us come to experience the assurance of Your grace, the promises of love and life, and the glory of eternal hope and peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HOBSON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that it will limit to 10 Members on each side requests for 1-minute recognition.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 160. Concurrent resolution to correct the enrollment of H.R. 3123.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2446) "An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for

other purposes.", and that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13, 17, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 38, 40, and 42, to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2518) "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.", and that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 11, 15, 23, 24, 34, 41, 49, 54, 57, 58, 65, 68, 69, 74, 92, 104, 108, 111, 117, 123, 124, 129, and 133, to the above-entitled bill.

THE SSC JURASSIC PORK MAKES A COMEBACK

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, earlier this summer I stood in this well and spoke about Jurassic Pork, the superconducting super collider. This House voted overwhelmingly, 280 to 150, to kill the funding for the super collider.

That vote represented the single largest spending cut in any appropriations bill this year.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this Jurassic Pork is far from being extinct. Through a labyrinth of parliamentary trickery, this SSC has again reared its dinosauric head. Today we have a chance finally to kill the largest piece of pork in the Federal budget. Huge cost overruns, with out-of-control spending by the contractor, have wasted millions of taxpayer dollars.

Many of my colleagues point to their own budget-cutting votes and to their zeal in cutting the budget to the tune of hundreds of thousands to a few million dollars.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a chance to kill \$13 billion of Federal spending. I ask the Members of the House to vote "no" and kill the superconducting super collider.

BLURRED FOREIGN POLICY, CONGRESSIONAL INTERFERENCE POINT TO CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, we appear to be on the verge of a constitutional crisis in this country. The President's power and responsibility to execute our Nation's foreign policy is being encroached upon by the legislative branch in ways that threaten to weaken the Office of the Presidency, and blur the lines that separate our branches of Government.

The inept conduct of our Nation's foreign policy, by a President who was largely untested on this subject during his campaign for office, has brought an outcry from the American people and a power-grab by some Members of Congress. The vacuum left by a visionless foreign policy that better resembles a teach-in by U.N. bureaucrats than a sovereign superpower, is being filled by voices on this end of Pennsylvania Avenue that have no business micromanaging affairs of state.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress rightfully should advise and speak its mind on issues of national interest. However, only one voice should be heard beyond our water's edge—and the responsibility for that voice should fall squarely on the President's shoulders. In the interest of this and future Presidents, the Congress should stay out of these matters of state and permit the Commander in Chief, and the American people, the clear lines of accountability that our Founding Fathers, intended.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

(Mr. COPPERSMITH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the conference report on energy and water appropriations for fiscal year 1994. I particularly object to increased funding for an unnecessary, expensive, and potentially dangerous breeder reactor, the advanced liquid metal reactor [ALMR].

But I do not oppose the conference report based simply on one program. I have a broader concern. This report undermines both bodies' attempts to make responsible deficit reduction choices.

During and after the budget debate some Members, and even the Democratic caucus itself, mentioned cuts

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

made by this House, such as the ALMR, in speeches and letters to constituents to show a commitment to cutting spending. But we make these hard choices in vain when conferees do little to uphold the will of the House they represent. The urgent need for deficit reduction dictates that conferees should adopt the lower approved funding level for many programs on which the two bodies disagree. Instead, this conference committee has chosen the higher number in 11 of 14 cases of disagreement on Department of Energy civilian programs. The final result of this conferencing up is that bill before us contains more total spending than either body's original bill.

Members cannot creditably claim to heed the call to cut spending first if we allow the process to undermine our efforts. Let us send the message that hard-won deficit reduction is too important to be sacrificed for expediency when final deals are done.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members to vote "no" on the conference report in its current form.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PAGE BOARD

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 127 of Public Law 97-377, the Chair appoints as Members of the House of Representatives Page Board the following Members of the House:

Mr. KILDEE of Michigan; and
Mr. TOWNS of New York.

APPOINTMENT TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 491 of the Higher Education Act, as amended by section 407 of Public Law 99-498, the Chair appoints on the part of the House, Mr. Thomas A. Butts of Ann Arbor, MI, to the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

APPOINTMENT TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE RECORDS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2702 of 44 U.S.C., as amended by Public Law 101-509, the Chair appoints the following member to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress on the part of the House:

Mr. Richard F. Fenno, Jr., of Rochester, NY.

REAPPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., FEDERAL HOLIDAY COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 4(a) of Public Law 98-

399, as amended by Public Law 101-30, the Chair reappoints as members of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission the following Members of the House:

Mr. WHEAT of Missouri;
Mr. SAWYER of Ohio;
Mr. REGULA of Ohio; and
Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

APPOINTMENT TO THE TASK FORCE TO MAKE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AT MILITARY BASES SCHEDULED FOR CLOSURE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2923 of Public Law 101-510, the Chair appoints Mr. Don Gray of Fort Washington, MD, to the Task Force to Make Findings and Recommendations for Environmental Restoration at Military Bases Scheduled for Closure.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 9355(a) of title 10, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy the following Members of the House:

Mr. DICKS of Washington;
Mr. HOAGLAND of Nebraska;
Mr. HEFLEY of Colorado; and
Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 3(a) of Public Law 86-380, the Chair appoints to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations the following Members of the House:

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey;
Mr. MORAN of Virginia; and
Mr. SCHIFF of New Mexico.

□ 1110

A TRIBUTE TO MAINE HEROES

(Ms. SNOWE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, this past week the State of Maine laid to rest two of its bravest sons, Sgt. Thomas Field of Lisbon and M. Sgt. Gary Gordon of Lincoln. We gave them the tribute and honor these heroes deserved. Both soldiers were killed in heavy fighting in Somalia. Gary Gordon was trying to save the crew of a downed helicopter, which included another Maine soldier, Tom Field, and Michael

Durant, who was taken as a prisoner of war.

I'd like to pay homage to these men's courage and to their bravery, and for paying the highest price a nation can ask of its soldiers—to give their lives for their country.

Across the country, in other hometowns, grieving families and friends have also paid their last respects to the other brave men who died. This is a troubling time for our Nation. It is a difficult time for the families of our fallen heroes. These men are the pride of America. They touch the hearts of a nation.

At a similar time of national mourning, Abraham Lincoln said this of America's fallen heroes: "That from these honored dead, we take increased devotion to their cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion. That we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain."

From this day onward, each and every one of us here must ensure that the deaths of these men shall not have been made in vain, and that we continue to remember the sacrifices they made for their country in the name of honor, liberty, freedom, and courage.

SUNDY MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

SUPPORT NORTH AMERICAN FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, with crises in Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia, and Russia, why create another one, Latin America, by rejecting the North American Free-Trade Agreement?

In less than a month, we will be voting on NAFTA. In my opinion, this will be one of the most important votes of this session.

According to a New York Times poll, roughly 50 percent of the American public knows nothing about NAFTA. It is our job to get the word out, that NAFTA will create jobs for Americans.

Unfortunately, we are still hearing a lot of scare stories about U.S. jobs being "sucked" south of the border. Yet, if this is really true, why are Japan and other Asian nations so worried about NAFTA?

According to a recent study by the University of Tokyo sponsored by Japan's Economic Planning Agency, NAFTA will make life more difficult for Japan and Southeast Asia.

NAFTA is a good agreement. Let us not put our heads in the sand by rejecting it.

TERMINATE THE SUPERCONDUCTING SUPER COLLIDER

(Mr. BOEHLERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, later today the House will face a crucial test that will determine whether we are serious about cutting the deficit and whether our words will be backed up with our deeds. I refer, of course, to the vote on the energy and water appropriations conference report. We will offer a motion to recommit with instructions to terminate this superconducting super collider [SSC].

One could hardly ask for a more precise test of the House's seriousness. The energy and water conferees have tried to appease Members' appetite for budget cutting by tossing us a few morsels of pork. But the pork in this report is in reality a red herring—if I may say so—the pork projects in this bill are designed to distract Members and throw them off the trail of their true quarry—giant, low priority, costly, mismanaged projects like the SSC. So today's vote pits pork against purpose.

Today's vote is a test of whether the House is willing to have its budget cutting efforts sabotaged by a small group of conferees following their own agenda. The House voted overwhelmingly—by 280 to 150—to kill the SSC in June, but the conferees capitulated to the Senate's desire to continue funding. If we accept this action from the conferees then the House amounts to nothing more than a very expensive version of Boys' State—just going through the motions of governing and leaving the tough decisions to others.

Let's show the American people that we're serious about budget cutting. Vote to recommit the energy and water bill and terminate the SSC.

CONSTITUTION DOES NOT SEPARATE GOD FROM AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, for decades Girl Scouts have recited a solemn pledge, "To serve God and country." Very simple, very straightforward. But this week the Girl Scouts may change their pledge to one of the following: Option A, to serve Allah, the Creator; or, Option B, a pledge to serve nothing or no one at all.

Mr. Speaker, this is amazing. I think this is going a little too far. The Constitution may separate church and state, but the Constitution never separated God and the American people.

I think this politically correct business is way off the deep end, and, in fact on this issue, it may end up on the Richter scale.

But let me say this: What is next? Will the politically correct begin referring to God as a significant other? By God, beam me up.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RICHARDSON). The Chair reminds individuals in the gallery not to use any manifestation of approval or disapproval.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE EDWARD LEFFLER

(Mr. ROHRABACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in sorrow over the passing of Edward Leffler.

He was a friend, a person whose positive spirit enriched the lives of all who knew him.

He was a professional whose skill guided the careers of many of music's great contemporary artists including the Beatles, Rolling Stones, Carpenters, Osmonds, and most recently Jude Cole and Sammy Hagar and Van Halen.

But beyond helping stars reach their potential, he created meaningful employment for thousands of working people: lighting technicians, recording engineers, record salesmen and women, ticket takers, and hosts of others behind the entertainment scene—working people who paid their bills, fed their families due to the business sense and leadership skills of Ed Leffler.

Ed was an American entrepreneur of the first order, a loving father to his twins Andrew and Ashley and an anchor of calm and decency in a tumultuous music arena.

He was a good human being who died of cancer. In that he is just a statistic. But as an individual he made his mark, did a professional job that provided entertainment for hundreds of millions and lived an honorable life.

Ed Leffler was much admired by me and many others. He will be missed.

MAWS (MARIN ABUSED WOMEN'S SERVICES) STUDY

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Marin Abused Women's Services in the Sixth District of California for the completion of their groundbreaking study on the role that men can take in preventing domestic violence.

It is particularly timely that the report findings were reported now—dur-

ing Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

Mr. Speaker, this study is the first of its kind because it examines men's relationship to the problem of domestic violence and outlines steps that men can take to play a role in abuse prevention. Up until now, Mr. Speaker, domestic abuse was viewed as a woman's problem, that required women's solutions. This report challenges that notion, and I encourage all my colleagues to read it.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, Congress can, and must, play a vital role in combating domestic violence. We can start by passing the Violence Against Women Act. I urge my colleagues in both Chambers to cosponsor the bill and work for its passage.

Mr. Speaker, a woman is battered every 15 seconds, or 6 million times each year. Every year, 4,000 women are battered to death. Women's very lives depend on the actions of each of us.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY IMPORTANT FOR AMERICA

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, later today we are going to be facing one of the most important national security votes that we will have in this session of Congress. I am referring to the attempt that is going to be made by my colleague from Pennsylvania to delete funding for the National Endowment for Democracy.

Mr. Speaker, there are some who have argued that bringing about this cut for the National Endowment for Democracy will be very good for deficit reduction. Frankly, using that as a deficit reduction plan sounds like cutting off your arm to successfully bring about a weight loss plan.

We have succeeded in defeating communism in spots throughout the world, but democracy has not yet succeeded. We need to ensure that we maintain funding for this very important National Endowment for Democracy so that Ronald Reagan's dream of ensuring democracy through ballots and not bullets succeeds.

□ 1120

A RESPONSIBILITY TO CUT SPENDING

(Mr. SHARP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, today we face a major test of whether or not the majority is going to rule and cut spending for the people of this country. Not only at stake is the vote on the

superconducting super collider that we will hear much about today but also the conference bill on energy and water appropriations has restored total funding, indeed, increased funding for next year for the amount to be spent on the advanced liquid metal reactor, which a large majority of the House of Representatives voted to kill and the administration called upon us to cut.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, this bill, in 11 instances out of 14 differences between the House and Senate, took the highest expenditure level that either House adopted, meaning that there was no intent, no will to make the cuts that we have all been advocating around this country.

The test is to vote to recommit or to reject the conference report on the energy and water appropriations.

UNREALISTIC NUMBERS

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, experts from all corners are already questioning the economic feasibility of the not-yet-final Clinton health plan. The numbers revealed so far just do not add up. One economist concludes the White House may have understated the cost by \$300 billion. Top administration officials, including Chief Economist Laura Tyson, privately dismiss the plan's rosy economic predictions—withholding constructive criticism in a show of misguided political loyalty. Entitlement spending already consumes more than 60 percent of our budget galloping ever faster to keep up with ever more promised benefits. Before we spend ourselves into oblivion we need to stop and remember the choice is not Clinton's health plan or no plan at all. There are other better choices—and guess what—we can implement those choices without making ourselves sick with more debt.

KILL THE SUPERCONDUCTING SUPER COLLIDER

(Mr. SLATTERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year 280 Members of this body voted to terminate funding for the superconducting super collider. This was the largest single cut in any appropriation bill adopted by this body this year.

Unfortunately, the other body included funding for the super collider in their version of the Energy and water appropriation bill. The conference committee did not include one Member of this body who voted with the huge majority, when it went to conference, to terminate funding for the collider.

It should come as no surprise that the conference committee quickly adopted the Senate position and ignored the will of 280 Members of this body, nearly two-thirds on both sides of the political aisle.

Today we will vote on that conference committee report. Mr. Speaker, we must stick to our position in the House and kill the super collider and save the taxpayers of this country at least \$10 billion.

I urge my colleagues to support our efforts to recommit the conference report with instructions to terminate funding for the super collider. This is our chance today to demonstrate to the American taxpayers that we are serious about cutting the deficit and cutting Federal spending. I urge my colleagues to stick to their position.

THE REAL CLINTON HEATH PLAN

(Mr. HOBSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, once again, there is a big disconnect between what President Bill Clinton says and what President Bill Clinton does. This time, it is on health care. President Clinton says his health plan does not rely on price controls and health rationing. But read President Clinton's plan.

Page 68 of the Clinton health plan, available in bookstores across America, says this: "A provider may not charge or collect from a patient a fee in excess of the fee schedule adopted by an alliance." Translation—the Clinton plan imposes national health care price controls, pure and simple. Health industry analyst J.D. Kleinke, writing in the Wall Street Journal, says the Clinton price controls will "curtail all new drug development for currently untreatable diseases." He says that is, and I quote, "tantamount to euthanasia."

What Bill Clinton says and what Bill Clinton does. Two different things, Mr. Speaker. That is why we need action now on a health plan. Let us enact the Republican health plan, "Action '93."

IN SUPPORT OF NAFTA

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of NAFTA and I'd like to address my comments to those in the House who have concluded that NAFTA would be good for our constituents, good for our working people, and good for the country, but who are concerned because some of our constituents have genuine fears about the plan, in part because of the fear-mongering they have been exposed to.

What I would like to say is that there is an antidote for fear and that is

truth. It has been my personal experience that if a Member of Congress shares with their constituents the truth about NAFTA many of those fears are converted to confidence.

When I have gone into townhall meetings and asked my constituents whether they wanted me to knock down Mexican trade barriers so that we could export more to Mexico, and thereby create jobs, they told me unequivocally, "yes." They would want me to vote for such a treaty. Of course, this is exactly what NAFTA does, and when I tell them this they respond with more hope and less fear. We have been sent here to make considered judgments. Many of our constituents haven't had the time or even interest to read this treaty. It is our responsibility to cast more light on this treaty. When we do so we will all agree that Roosevelt was right. "All we have to fear is fear itself," and that the Good Book is right—"Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall set you free."

CLINTON'S "WALDO" HEALTH CARE PLAN

(Ms. PRYCE of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I think we should dub the Clinton administration's health plan "the Waldo health care bill." Let me show you why.

There is a lovable little fellow named Waldo. As any of you who have children know, this is a "Where's Waldo?" book. Waldo has made a career out of being very hard to find. This is the Clinton health care plan briefing book. This accompanied the President's address to the Nation on health care weeks ago. Page after page of rhetoric. In both books you will be hard pressed to find the central character. With this health care bill, President Clinton is well on his way to surpassing Waldo in the hard to find, impossible to pin down category.

In fact, the only real difference between the two is that you can rest assured that Waldo is in the picture. If you don't believe me ask any 3-year-old and they'll find him. But, after weeks of waiting, the Clinton health care plan is still not in the picture. If you don't believe me, ask any Member of Congress and they'll tell you they haven't seen it.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to ask the question—where's the bill, Bill?

NATIONAL MAMMOGRAPHY DAY

(Mrs. LLOYD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, every year for the past 4 years, National

Breast Cancer Awareness Month has received greater participation and interest. It is clear that this commemorative has been very effective in increasing the public awareness of this disease. But fighting breast cancer is more than just awareness. That is why I am so happy that yesterday the President signed into law a resolution that I introduced designating today as "National Mammography Day."

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important day because it focuses on the early detection of breast cancer. The National Cancer Institute has estimated that there will be a total of 183,000 cases of breast cancer in 1993, with 46,000 deaths.

There is no known cure for breast cancer. Until we find a cure, early detection and treatment is the best chance that we have against its early stages. This is an essential part of our early detection.

At the present time, there is some controversy over the need of an annual mammogram. But as a survivor, I can tell my colleagues that I am living proof that an annual mammogram can save a life.

Yes, our mothers and our daughters and our wives, our sisters are all being diagnosed with this disease rapidly. So early detection can greatly increase the odds of their survival.

I would like to thank President Clinton and my colleagues who helped to make this day possible.

A CALL FOR INVESTIGATION AT DOE

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, how many bureaucrats does it take to change a light bulb?

According to the CBS program "60 Minutes" this past Sunday night, if it is the Department of Energy, it takes 43.

As "60 Minutes" reported that it took two people to actually change the bulb at the DOE Savannah River Plant in South Carolina.

But it took 41 people to write over 300 pages of work orders telling how to go about it.

No wonder that almost everyone except the most liberal among us have lost faith in our Federal bureaucracy to do anything economically or efficiently.

As "60 Minutes" also reported that the Savannah River Plant has over 20,000 employees, many with nothing to do, and producing nothing whatsoever.

That, in spite of this, DOE paid out over \$200 million in totally unnecessary overtime.

That, despite the wasteful operation going on there, millions of taxpayer dollars have been paid in bonuses, in-

cluding \$4.7 million in unauthorized bonuses that it took DOE 2 years to discover.

I call on Energy Secretary O'Leary to immediately and personally investigate these very serious charges by "60 Minutes."

□ 1130

WAKE UP CONGRESS, PEOPLE IN AMERICA VOTE

(Mr. APPELGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. APPELGATE. Mr. Speaker, farmers are paid money not to grow food, yet 31 million Americans are going hungry. Millions of manufacturing jobs have left the country, yet 36 million Americans are living in poverty. The United States has the best medical technology in the world, and yet, among the industrial nations of the world we are 18th in life expectancy, we are 24th in infant mortality, because it is not available to everybody; and 37 million Americans have no health insurance.

The rich are getting richer, the poor are getting poorer, and yet we are spending and sending billions of dollars more to every other country in the world to help their economic structure, and many in Congress say nothing is broke.

Wake up Congress, the people also vote.

SUPPORT OUR TROOPS

(Mr. COLLINS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, over the past weekend, I visited Fort Benning, GA, on the occasion of its 75th anniversary. Fort Benning had much to celebrate, but as I talked with many of the career soldiers, I found their morale is suffering greatly.

Mr. Speaker, as the events in Somalia and Haiti are played out on the international scene, many of these career soldiers are reminded of Vietnam. They know what it was like to return from a political war as heroes on the battlefield but unappreciated at home.

Mr. Speaker, I visited one of our wounded soldiers who is still recovering, at Martin Army Hospital, from his close encounter in Somalia. He was the victim of a political mission gone sour. His colleagues asked me to deliver a message to this Congress: Give us the means and the support and we can accomplish any military mission.

Mr. Speaker, I add my own advice to this Congress and this President. Use the military wisely and with force but do not ask our troops to be politicians. They are proud soldiers who deserve our support in every way possible.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RICHARDSON). The Chair will entertain one additional 1 minute on each side.

FORT BENNING'S 75TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. BISHOP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the home of the infantry and the dedicated soldiers at Fort Benning, GA. Fort Benning was established 75 years ago, on October 7, 1918. Since its beginning, Fort Benning has trained our Army's leaders—George C. Marshall, Omar Bradley, Dwight Eisenhower, George Patton, Joseph Stillwell, Colin Powell, and Norman Schwarzkopf. And Fort Benning remains the primary training base for combat leaders—infantrymen, rangers, airborne. Fort Benning's soldiers stand ready to defend human rights and our national security, many paying the ultimate price. World War II and Desert Storm, were won in the classrooms and in the training areas of this Georgian post. In the 1940's, the Big Red One, trained there; as did Patton's 2d Armored Division. The 11th Air Assault Division was activated at Fort Benning, and later merged with the 2d Infantry Division to form the 1st Cavalry Division which gained fame in the rice paddies and mountains of Vietnam. Fort Benning units have served with distinction in Panama, Southwest Asia and are serving in Somalia. I salute Fort Benning, its history and its leaders. I also salute their families who have stood by these men and women during the call of duty. Fort Benning remains a vibrant platform for the projection of America's combat power, wherever, whenever it is needed.

Mr. Speaker, happy birthday to Fort Benning.

ANNOUNCING SPECIAL ORDER ON STATUS OF TROOPS IN SOMALIA

(Mr. DORNAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, when I last spoke on the floor Friday afternoon, I said I was going to Somalia, even if I had to fly commercial through Nairobi. Thankfully, Les Aspin, our Secretary of Defense, supported my request for the trip and I was able to hitch a ride on a transport plane headed to Somalia to deliver lumber. I spent about 40 hours in the air to have some time on the ground in Somalia yesterday morning. I will do an hour special order tonight to report on my trip.

One pertinent observation is that we have the finest young men and women in the field ever, equally as impressive as our troops in Desert Storm.

I see my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] on the floor. I would say to the gentleman that all our troops over there ask if we would help make sure that they get the same benefits as the soldiers who served in Desert Storm. They are in combat conditions over there, and we have had 26 men killed in action just since August 8. The least we can do is give them tax-exempt status.

Mr. Speaker, I also said Friday that there was one American body left unidentified, the fourth man dragged through the streets of Mogadishu. He was identified by his mother on Monday night. He is William David Cleveland, Jr., 32 years of age, five children. He was desecrated in the streets of Somalia, but is finally home on his beloved American soil.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2491, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 275 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 275

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report and amendments reported from conference in disagreement on the bill (H.R. 2491) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report are waived. The conference report, amendments in disagreement, and motions printed in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference to dispose of amendments in disagreement shall be considered as read. It shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider a motion offered by Representative Stokes of Ohio or a designee that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113 and concur therein with the amendment printed in section 2 of this resolution. That motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on that motion to final adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. The amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113 is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert: "Provided further, That, pursuant to Public Law 102-486, an amount equal to not more than 50 percent of all utility energy efficiency and water conservation cash rebates received by the National Aero-

nautics and Space Administration may be made available for additional energy efficiency and water conservation measures, including facility surveys: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for other than termination costs of the advanced solid rocket motor program.

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amounts appropriated in this Act for fiscal year 1994 shall be: \$4,853,500,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration 'Space flight, control and data communications', \$517,700,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration 'Construction of facilities', \$7,529,300,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration 'Research and development', \$1,480,853,000 for the Environmental Protection Agency 'Hazardous substance superfund', \$1,998,500,000 for the National Science Foundation 'Research and related activities', and \$110,000,000 for the National Science Foundation 'Academic research infrastructure'."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes of debate time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 275 provides for the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 2491, making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994.

The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration.

The rule further provides that the conference report, amendments in disagreement, and motions printed in the joint explanatory statement to dispose of amendments in disagreement shall be considered as read when called for consideration.

In addition, unlike the rule which the House considered last week, this rule makes in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, a motion which would allow the House to express its will concerning the advanced solid rocket motor programs. The motion, to be offered by Chairman STOKES or his designee, provides that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113 and concur therein with an amendment printed in section 2 of the rule. The motion is debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion without intervening motion.

The amendment to Senate amendment 113 which this rule makes in

order states, "none of the funds provided in this Act to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for other than termination costs of the advanced solid rocket motor program." By making this motion in order, the rule gives the House exactly what the advanced solid rocket motor program's critics have requested: a specific, clear, and forthright opportunity to expressly end the program.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H.R. 2491, the bill for which the committee has recommended this rule, provides \$87.6 billion for vital national initiatives, including veterans' health, environmental protection, housing assistance, and space.

We are already 19 days into the 1994 fiscal year. The continuing resolution expires Thursday. I ask my colleagues to support the rule so that we may proceed with consideration of the merits of this vital legislation.

□ 1140

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] has ably explained the provisions of the rule.

The focus of debate on this measure has been the ASRM Program, and I would like to remind my colleagues of the other significant programs funded by this bill.

H.R. 2491 provides essential funding for programs to meet the critical needs of our Nation's veterans, and to accommodate the housing requirements of the elderly and the needy.

We need to move expeditiously on this appropriation bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule so that we can proceed with consideration of this conference report.

There will be an effort made today to do away with the ASRM Program. I think that it is imperative that we go forward with this measure and get it signed by the President. Our veterans cannot be denied help. We know that we need our HUD programs. We need the various independent agency programs. And I do not know why there would be any opposition to this measure. It would be based only on technicalities, in my opinion.

We must fight to save our Selective Service System. In the case of a national emergency, we cannot let that system go down the drain. And I support the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] in his efforts to preserve it and to keep it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Republican chairman emeritus for yielding me this time. I rise to state that I intend to call for a recorded vote on this rule, but it is not

because I believe this rule is inherently unfair. I will call a vote to make note of a major inconsistency between the rhetoric of some on the other side regarding Senate legislative amendments and their actions to mitigate this problem.

Mr. Speaker, during nearly 6 months of hearings in our Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, one recurring complaint stood out. It was made by authorizing committee chairmen who contend that the Appropriations Committee is usurping their jurisdiction by accepting Senate legislative amendments in appropriations conference reports that would otherwise be subject to a point of order in the House.

Mr. Speaker, this is a legitimate problem that needs to be addressed, but I would remind my colleagues that current House rules provide a remedy. For example, clause 2 of rule XX requires that these Senate amendments be brought back to the House for a separate vote in technical disagreement. However, it is the Rules Committee, on behalf of both the authorizing committees and the appropriations committee, that consistently waives points of order against these provisions.

This is the reason I was both surprised and pleased to see a letter that was sent to the chairman of the Rules Committee on October 5 by the chairmen of four major authorizing committees. I will place the letter in the RECORD. In the letter, these committee chairmen state:

The purpose of this letter is to request that the Committee on Rules not grant any waivers of points of order against clause 2(c) of Rule XXI (prohibiting legislation in an appropriations bill) and clause 2 of Rule XX (prohibiting House conferees from agreeing to the Senate amendments which would violate clause 2 of Rule XXI) for any appropriations conference report.

Guess what, Mr. Speaker. There are 20 Senate amendments in the VA-HUD appropriations conference report which constitute legislating in an appropriations bill, and this rule waives points of order against those provisions.

The distinguished subcommittee chairman, Mr. STOKES, noted that these amendments do not create major policy problems, and that they would have been in order as limitation amendments in the House committee-reported bill.

The first point is open to interpretation, but the chairman is right on the second point, Mr. Speaker. However, because the House did not defeat the motion to rise, these amendments are still in violation of clause 2 of rule XX.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for the rhetoric of this issue to be matched by action. If my colleagues are serious about restoring the prerogatives of the House and reducing the number of legislative provisions in appropriations conference reports, then a "no" vote on this rule is the only appropriate vote.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the letter previously referred to, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 5, 1993.

Hon. JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you may know, over the last several years, we have repeatedly raised concerns about the practice of including Senate-added legislative provisions in conference reports on appropriations bills. In that regard, we have appreciated your assistance and consideration of the positions of the authorizing committees. To further resolve those concerns, we offered an amendment to the House Rules which was adopted by the Democratic Caucus and included in the Rules of the House for the 103rd Congress. Under clause (2)(b)(2) of rule XXVIII, the chairman of an authorizing committee with jurisdiction over the legislative matter reported in technical disagreement now has the right to offer a preferential motion to insist on disagreement. We believe that this amendment will help to restore the prerogatives of the House and significantly reduce the number of legislative provisions in appropriations bills. As the House begins to consider the first set of appropriations conference reports under the amended rule, we and other chairmen of the authorizing committees plan to monitor the reports carefully for any inclusion of legislative language.

The purpose of this letter is to request that the Committee on Rules not grant any waivers of points of order against clause 2(c) of rule XXI (prohibiting legislation in an appropriations bill) and clause 2 of rule XX (prohibiting House conferees from agreeing to Senate amendments which would violate clause 2 of Rule XXI) for any appropriations conference report. We believe that any Senate amendments proposing to add legislative language should follow regular order and be brought back to the House for a separate vote on technical disagreement. Providing blanket waivers of points of order, or providing waivers to permit the conference report to contain legislative language, would substantially infringe on the prerogatives of the authorizing committees and vitiate the effect of the amendment to the House Rules adopted by the Caucus and the House early this session.

We appreciate your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.,
GEORGE MILLER,
NORMAN Y. MINETA,
Members of Congress.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for giving me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. But in the amendments and disagreement I will vote for the Senate amendment to fund the Selective Service System. This motion will be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. Speaker, really, now is not the time to eliminate the Selective Service System. If this motion by the gen-

tleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is defeated, the Director of Selective Service has told me only yesterday that he will close down the whole system on December 1. In other words, the local boards in your communities are out of business, the State Selective Service offices controlled by the Governor of each State are out of business.

This is a drastic step we are getting ready to take here with only one committee having taken action on this major issue.

I point out also, Mr. Speaker, in the case of an emergency and the Selective Service System had to call up young men, the big problem is with calling up doctors, nurses, and health care professionals. The Director tells me that within 42 days he has the software, the computers and equipment to get these doctors and nurses on board to treat in a minimal conflict where young men are hurt. At this time we do not have the medical professionals to do it. It is a terrible mistake today if we eliminate the Selective Service System, and I hope our colleagues will vote not to do this.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

□ 1150

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding this time to me.

I also thank him for his support of the motion that I am to make later on when we take up the VA-HUD and Independent Agencies conference report. My motion will ask this body to recede to the Senate position which would restore the funds to maintain the Selective Service System.

Ladies and gentleman, later on this morning we are going to be taking up the Commerce/State/Justice appropriation conference report. That bill has another amendment in disagreement which deals with the National Endowment for Democracy. When that amendment came on the floor some time ago, I voted to cut the National Endowment for Democracy because I felt that it was not being effective.

I am going to change my vote on NED this afternoon. I am going to support it now because something critical is happening over in the former Soviet Union, in Russia. Elections are being called over there, and the country is standing at the crossroads.

This could be one of the most critical elections in the history of this world. The National Endowment for Democracy is going to be able to utilize its resources to make sure that those elections are fair and democratic. The whole future of the world depends on that.

Ladies and gentlemen, something else depends on that, too, and that is the Selective Service System. My

amendment to keep Selective Service System funded failed several weeks ago by just 1 vote, not counting the delegate votes. By one vote, the House decided to abolish the Selective Service System. Since that time, there has been a coup attempt over in Russia. We all know what happened there. We all know what happened in Somalia, where we lost 18 members of our Armed Services in a very, very tragic situation. We know what is happening in Bosnia today.

We need to maintain the Selective Service System.

I do not have to tell you that today we depend on an all-voluntary military. We get a cross-section of American young men and women from all across this country.

Mr. Speaker, since we depend on this all-voluntary military, it is absolutely imperative that our military recruiters be able to define which young men and women are available for the military today.

In many instances, in many schools across the Nation, our recruiters are being denied the ability to go on campus. The only way they have to get the names of young men and women, in order to sit down and explain to them what an honorable career the U.S. Armed Forces are today, is from the list maintained by the Selective Service System.

If we are going to maintain this all-voluntary military, we have to have this backup situation.

I ask Members, when I offer that motion on behalf of myself and the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman MONTGOMERY, to think about that. Reverse your votes, let us pass this amendment to maintain the necessary funds.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, let me read two sentences from this new rule adopted by the Committee on Rules.

First of all, the language that I testified on last week recommending that the Rules Committee adopt, this is the Rules Committee language:

It shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider a motion offered by Representative Stokes of Ohio or a designee that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113 and concur therein with the amendment printed in section 2 of this resolution.

What that means, Mr. Speaker, written in the rule:

Provided further, That none of the funds provided in this act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for other than termination costs of the advanced solid rocket motor program.

As somebody who fought very, very hard against the rule when this came

up before, I believe this rule is in order and is a good rule because it does firmly resolve two questions: First, the question of the advanced solid rocket motor, something that the House has spoken to very, very adamantly in the past, with 379 votes against that program on a previous straight up-and-down amendment; 305 votes against that particular program on a rule. We do not want this program going forward on the merits.

It is over budget, and it is not needed from a scientific basis.

Second, Mr. Speaker, I think that the integrity of this institution, of the House, is being listened to by this rule. We have voted so many times in the House of Representatives to kill programs. We send them over to the Senate, and they come back either with the same funding or increased funding.

I think this rule insures that this will go back to the Senate and that the Senate knows that we are firm, we are committed, we are in unison, we do not want this program coming back to the House at all. We have finally put a nail in the coffin and a stake in the heart of the advanced solid rocket motor.

Again, I commend the Committee on Rules for their hard work.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Stokes amendment to terminate the ASRM, advanced solid rocket motor.

Mr. Speaker, and I wish to commend Chairman STOKES for his outstanding leadership on this difficult issue.

If you were one of the 378 Members of this body who voted earlier this year to terminate the ASRM you can support this rule and the Stokes amendment which the rule provides for.

This is what we have all waited for, for a long, long, time.

At last we have been able to terminate a large, expensive, and wasteful Federal program, one of the few successes in this regard that I can remember.

While many of my colleagues would rather see the \$58 million over and above the \$100 million provided for the ASRM termination costs go toward deficit reduction, or to stay within the NASA budget, I say to you the Stokes' amendment is the preferred position. Let me explain why.

Let us not deceive ourselves that the \$58 million would have gone toward deficit reduction if it had not been transferred to the EPA, the NASP, and National Science Foundation.

Under the House budget rules, that money would not have gone toward the deficit, but rather, would be available for use in other appropriations bills and we all know around here that money available is money used.

Second, the \$58 million will go toward worthwhile projects. The NASP is a leading-edge technology in aviation that this country must pursue if we are to maintain our technological superiority in the critical area of aerospace.

And the Superfund in EPA is always in need of resources to work on the backlog of cleaning up the Superfund sites in practically every State.

I wish to raise another point, Mr. Speaker.

If the \$58 million in ASRM funding had not been taken out of the NASA budget, there would have remained the possibility that NASA would have come under great pressure to reprogram that money just to keep the ASRM program on life support, thereby allowing the ASRM to survive another day.

The Stokes amendment will preclude that. If we pass the Stokes amendment, the ASRM is dead once and for all.

I urge a "yes" vote on the Stokes amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that it is important to me, this Member, that the House know the quality of leadership the gentleman has shown on this issue. He has worked very intently on behalf of the interests of the country, and his district as well. I have great respect for the work he has done. I certainly hope the House recognizes the quality of the work and the level of interest the gentleman has shown regarding ARSM. Without his leadership this rule would not be before us. I certainly respect the work he has done.

Mr. HANSEN. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] for his kind words, and I thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman emeritus for yielding this time to me.

I am a little troubled by what we heard in the Committee on Rules regarding the disposition of this \$157 million that we are supposedly saving the taxpayers by this action that we are going to take up.

Americans may be surprised to hear that we are not actually saving this money. We are not applying this money to reduce our enormous Federal deficit. In fact, the bulk of these funds, at least \$100 million and probably more, are going to be needed to close down the program that we are talking about closing down. More than \$50 million, under the rule, will be reprogrammed for other, existing programs

covered in the bill. So let us be clear about what we are doing: None of the funds we are saving are actually being saved in the way that most Americans define saving—that is, putting money aside to put off debts or plan to save for a rainy day or whatever.

□ 1200

We are not reducing the debt or the deficit. This is not a promised rescission. This is spending \$157 million a different way, but it is still spending it. Changing the label does not reduce the debt, and frankly it does not fool Americans.

Instead of focusing on real cuts that will actually save money, President Clinton is talking about major new Federal programs in at least six different policy areas: health care, crime, education, national service, welfare, and job retraining.

These are all important areas. How are we going to pay for them? The President is asking for more and bigger Government. Those things cost lots of money; but if we continue to compute savings from cuts the way it is being proposed to do in this particular appropriations bill, then I say, hold on to your wallets, America, because Uncle Sam and President Bill are going to be coming around one more time and it is going to be higher taxes for all of us, and none of us want that. This is not the way to save money.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this rule.

I think it is so important that this be adopted, contrary to the opposition of some Members of this body. We must protect our veterans. We must encourage HUD to build housing for those who need it. We need to fund the independent agencies included in this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceeding on this resolution will be postponed until later today.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2501

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the

name of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 2501.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2519, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 276 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 276

Resolved, That all points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2519) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, are waived. The motions printed in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference to dispose of amendments in disagreement shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 276 is the rule providing for the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 2519, the Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 1994. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report. The rule also provides that the motions printed in the joint explanatory statement of the conference committee to dispose of amendments in disagreement, shall be considered as read.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, appropriates funds for the Commerce, Justice and State Departments, for the federal judiciary, and for related agencies. The final agreement is fiscally sound while providing needed funds to carry out our responsibilities relating to crime, immigration, competitiveness, and international peacekeeping. This final agreement is \$219 million less than the fiscal year 1993 funding level, and \$1.5 billion less than was requested by the administration. The report includes five amendments including three small business issues, one relating to the International Trade Administration and one matter relating to the National Oceanic and Atmos-

pheric Administration [NOAA]. All of these amendments have been reviewed and cleared by the authorizing committees.

Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent rule which received unanimous support in the House Rules Committee. I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me first state that there are a number of good provisions in this conference report. To address the problems of illegal immigration along our southern border, it provides for 600 new Border Patrol agents and \$40 million for INS detention facilities. In addition, it will allow us to reconsider that ill-fated vote in July to eliminate funding for the National Endowment for Democracy.

The chairman of the subcommittee will ask the House to recede to the Senate amendment on NED and provide \$35 million for this important national security program.

Without question, Mr. Speaker, NED will continue to help those struggling to maintain freedom and democracy in Russia, Eastern Europe, the Baltics, and Central America. NED programs are committed to strengthening democratic institutions through ballots rather than bullets. NED is also our best hope for bringing democracy to totalitarian bastions like China, Vietnam, and Cuba.

Despite these programs, Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to ask for a no vote on this rule.

When the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill was first reported out of the Appropriations Committee, it followed the Natcher model by going straight to the floor without a rule. I applauded that decision because it meant the bill was considered under the established rules of the House.

Regrettably, this conference report contains a slew of pork-barrel earmarks that violate House rules regarding scope and legislating in an appropriations bill. While I do not want to take these rules violations lightly, I am specifically concerned about violations of rules 20 and 28, which require a separate House vote on Senate non-germane and legislative provisions.

As I mentioned during the debate on the VA-HUD appropriations conference report rule we constantly hear complaints from authorizing committee chairmen that the Appropriations Committee is usurping their jurisdiction by accepting Senate legislative and non-germane amendments. In fact, in testimony before our Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, the Speaker stated:

It is difficult sometimes to conclude authorizing jurisdiction with the Senate because of the tendency of the Senate to move these questions through the appropriations process.

Mr. Speaker, this problem will continue to be a source of friction between

our two Chambers unless we act to put a stop to it. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I urge a no vote on this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I include the letter to which I referred earlier in my statement, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 5, 1993.

Hon. JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you may know, over the last several years, we have repeatedly raised concerns about the practice of including Senate-added legislative provisions in conference reports on appropriations bills. In that regard, we have appreciated your assistance and consideration of the positions of the authorizing committees. To further resolve those concerns, we offered an amendment to the House Rules which was adopted by the Democratic Caucus and included in the Rules of the House for 103rd Congress. Under clause (2)(b)(2) of the Rule XXVIII, the Chairman of an authorizing committee with jurisdiction over the legislative matter reported in technical disagreement now has the right to offer a preferential motion to insist on disagreement. We believe that this amendment will help to restore the prerogatives of the House and significantly reduce the number of legislative provisions in appropriations bills. As the House begins to consider the first set of appropriations conference reports under the amended rule, we and other Chairmen of the authorizing committees plan to monitor the reports carefully for any inclusion of legislative language.

The purpose of this letter is to request that the Committee on Rules not grant any waivers of points of order against clause 2(c) of Rule XXI (prohibiting legislation in an appropriations bill) and clause 2 of Rule XX (prohibiting House conferees from agreeing to Senate amendments which would violate clause 2 of Rule XXI) for any appropriations conference report. We believe that any Senate amendments proposing to add legislative language should follow regular order and be brought back to the House for a separate vote on technical disagreement. Providing blanket waivers of points of order, or providing waivers to permit the conference report to contain legislative language, would substantially infringe on the prerogatives of the authorizing committees and vitiate the effect of the amendment to the House Rules adopted by the Caucus and the House early this session.

We appreciate your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.,
GEORGE MILLER,
NORMAN Y. MINETA,
Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very diligent ranking member of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary of the Committee on Appropriations that deals with this issue, my friend and classmate, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me. I will be brief.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule. This bill is a good conference report. It needs to be approved, and I think it is noncontroversial.

□ 1210

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to just say during the discussion on the rule, however, that when the conference report comes up, I am going to take some time, and I hope we can have some other Members come to the floor and discuss some provisions that are in the statement of managers in this conference report that attempt to reform our contribution and our effort with the United Nations, particularly how the United Nations commits America's interests in these various peacekeeping operations around the world.

Mr. Speaker, we are now in 18 so-called peacekeeping operations around the world, including, of course, Somalia and Haiti, and there are more pending. We get billed right now 31.7 percent of the costs, not to mention, of course, the blood that is spilled by Americans and others in these so-called peacekeeping missions.

The conference statement of managers does two or three different things. First, it requires that the administration notify the Congress at least 15 days in advance of when they anticipate voting for another peacekeeping mission in the United Nations. It requires the administration to notify the Congress of the mission that is to be attempted, the goals, the cost, how we are going to get in and how we are going to get out, just so we can plan our budgetary work.

Also the statement of managers states that we are withholding 10 percent of our general contribution to the United Nations until they appoint an inspector general, as we have been insisting they do for years and years, to account for the waste, fraud, and abuse in the U.N. general budget.

In addition, the statement of managers requires the United States to notify the United Nations that we will not pay more than 25 percent of these peacekeeping costs. We are presently billed 31.7 percent. We believe that 25 percent is too much, given the nature of the world's economies, but certainly we should pay no more than 25 percent, which is the amount we pay of the general budget of the United Nations. This bill provides for just that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the rule and of the conference report, and I would request that those Members who would like to participate in these discussions about these U.N. peacekeeping efforts, what should be done, the cost, and the like, join in the general discussion when the conference report actually comes to the floor.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I urge a no vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.
The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2445, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2445) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Thursday, October 14, 1993, at page H7906.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL].

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY], and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to yield time to other Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present the conference report on the fiscal year 1994 energy and water development appropriations bill for your favorable consideration. Our colleagues will recall that debate on this bill occurred in the House on June 24, and the bill was passed by a vote of 350 to 73. The Senate passed the bill on September 30 by a vote of 89 to 10.

Mr. Speaker, our conference committee meeting was held on Thursday, October 14. I wish to compliment our friends from the other body, particularly the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON] the chairman of the Senate subcommittee, for the fine spirit of compromise displayed in the conference meeting. I also wish to thank my colleagues, the House conferees, for their support and their valuable contributions during the conference deliberations.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the conference action on the superconducting super collider. During the June debate on the bill, the House voted 280 to 150 to terminate the superconducting super collider. The Senate in September voted to fully fund the superconducting super collider by a vote of 57 to 42.

The conferees took very seriously the vote in both the House and Senate. The

conferees, of course, spent more time on this issue than any other in conference. We asked the Senate to recede to the House and they were adamant in their insistence on the Senate position. Like the House, the Senate has a right to their position. In order to eliminate gridlock, we have included the superconducting super collider in the conference and I urge your support.

Since the House and Senate action on this bill, the President, on October 12, pledged his strong support for the project and cited it as a project of highest priority to his administration. In fact, the President called me personally declaring his support. The Secretary of Energy, in a letter dated October 13, urged support of the project and advised of a number of management improvements. The conferees have expressed their intention to hold the Secretary of Energy to a limit on the total cost of the project of less than \$11 billion.

Now I would like to comment on other aspects of the conference agreement.

In total the conference agreement is \$130,664,000 below the President's budget request, and \$26,064,000 below the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation for budget authority.

Mr. Speaker, for the various agencies and programs under the jurisdiction of the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee, the committee of conference recommends \$22,215,382,000 in new budget authority. This amount is \$130,664,000 below the budget request, \$484,938,000 above the House bill and \$22,765,000 above the Senate bill.

The conference agreement we present to you today is the culmination of many months of effort on the part of the House committee and the same review by the Senate committee. During this period we have heard testimony from hundreds of witnesses—contained in eight hearing volumes of thousands of pages.

The House considered the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill on the floor over a 2-day period. The Senate had a total of 47 numbered amendments to the bill. But, within those 47 amendments, there were approximately 400 individual items in disagreement. The conference agreement represents the best efforts of the House and Senate conferees to achieve consensus on each of those items. Many items had to be reduced or changed to accomplish agreement with the Senate.

In addition, we had to keep in mind the need to have a bill that was acceptable to the administration.

Your House conferees did their best to maintain the House position. However, to bring back a conference report that is within the budget allocation for the energy and water development programs, a great many items had to be compromised.

We would like more money for energy and the water projects. But, we have only limited funds for these items, and therefore, we cannot provide all of the funds for all of the programs and projects to the extent we would like.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement contains \$3,907,130,000 in title I for the Army Corps of Engineers. This is \$5,777,000 higher than the bill as passed by the House and \$26,010,000 below the Senate-passed bill. These funds will finance 556 water resources projects in the planning or construction phase, and provide for urgently needed operation and maintenance activities at completed projects.

For title II, the Bureau of Reclamation, the conferees recommended a total of \$910,294,000 which is \$2,047,000 more than the House-passed bill and \$2,935,000 more than the Senate-passed bill. This will fund 114 water resources projects in the planning or construction phase and provide funds for operation and maintenance of 36 projects.

In my view, the conference agreement provides for a financially prudent and environmentally sound water resources development program.

The conference agreement contains \$16,964,840,000 for the Department of Energy programs in title III. This includes \$3,223,910,000 for energy supply, research and development activities; \$345,295,000 for power marketing administrations; \$260,000,000 for the nuclear waste disposal fund; and \$1,615,114,000 for general science and research activities. The energy accounts include \$347,384,000 for solar, geothermal, hydropower, hydrogen research, and electric energy systems and storage; \$341,364,000 for nuclear energy; \$347,595,000 for magnetic fusion; and \$801,965,000 for basic energy sciences. In addition, funding of \$640,000,000 has been provided for the superconducting super collider. The conference agreement provides a total of \$10,860,808,000 for atomic energy defense activities. Within this bill, \$6,185,653,000 is provided for defense and nondefense envi-

ronmental restoration and cleanup activities which is an increase of \$644,412,000 over the fiscal year 1993 funding level.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement includes \$433,118,000 for nine independent agencies and commissions in title IV, including the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. Speaker, there are several people who made it possible to complete the conference agreement. I want to make special note of the contributions made by two Appropriations Committee staff members. Lori Whipp has worked tirelessly and with incredible skill in putting this conference report together. All of the tables and scorekeeping computations needed to develop this bill were prepared by Tim Buck who consistently works under very tight deadlines imposed by the subcommittee. I would also like to thank Ken Hall, who has been on detail to the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development from the Corps of Engineers, for his assistance during the entire fiscal year 1994 appropriations process. Lori, Tim and Ken deserve our very special thanks for their help in bringing this bill to the House for its consideration today.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the Members to support the hard work of my subcommittee and pass the conference report and amendments which will be presented to the House.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of my remarks I would like to insert a table in the RECORD which summarizes the financial aspects of the conference agreement.

I would like to call the Members' attention to several minor printing errors in the conference report printed in the October 14, 1993, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

On page H7908, column one, under Amendment No. 2, "engineers" should be "engineering"; and "currently" should be "concurrently".

On page H7909, column one, under Amendment No. 4, "authorization" should be "authorized"; "thought" should be "through"; "of" should be "to" and "if" should be "is".

On page H7909, column two, under Amendment No. 4, "are" should be "were".

On page H7947, column two, under Amendment No. 29, "most" should be "more".

On page H7947, column three, under Amendment No. 28, "ractor" should be "reactor".

FY 1994 ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2445)

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL						
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY						
Corps of Engineers - Civil						
General Investigations.....	175,780,000	157,800,000	207,540,000	208,544,000	207,540,000	+ 31,760,000
Construction, general.....	1,360,503,000	1,206,237,000	1,389,138,000	1,441,167,000	1,400,875,000	+ 40,372,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee.....	351,182,000	343,000,000	352,475,000	348,875,000	348,875,000	- 2,307,000
Operation and maintenance, general.....	1,596,666,000	1,667,700,000	1,691,350,000	1,673,704,000	1,688,990,000	+ 92,322,000
Regulatory program.....	86,000,000	92,000,000	92,000,000	92,000,000	92,000,000	+ 8,000,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies.....	190,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	- 170,000,000
General expenses.....	142,000,000	148,500,000	148,500,000	148,500,000	148,500,000	+ 6,500,000
Oil spill research.....		350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	+ 350,000
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil.....	3,902,133,000	3,625,387,000	3,901,353,000	3,933,140,000	3,907,130,000	+ 4,997,000
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Bureau of Reclamation						
General Investigations.....	12,540,000	12,714,000	13,109,000	14,409,000	13,819,000	+ 1,279,000
Construction program.....	470,568,000	431,848,000	484,423,000	480,898,000	484,423,000	- 6,145,000
Operation and maintenance.....	274,780,000	282,898,000	282,898,000	282,898,000	282,898,000	+ 8,138,000
Loan program.....	4,102,000	5,800,000	12,183,000	13,500,000	13,500,000	+ 9,398,000
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(8,000,000)	(11,836,000)	(18,726,000)	(21,000,000)	(21,000,000)	(+ 13,000,000)
General administrative expenses.....	53,745,000	54,034,000	54,034,000	54,034,000	54,034,000	+ 289,000
Emergency fund.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	
Colorado River Dam fund (by transfer, permanent authority).....	(-6,563,000)	(-7,168,000)	(-7,168,000)	(-7,168,000)	(-7,168,000)	(-605,000)
Central Utah project completion account.....		21,000,000	25,770,000	25,770,000	25,770,000	+ 25,770,000
Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account.....		9,850,000	9,850,000	9,850,000	9,850,000	+ 9,850,000
Central Valley project restoration fund.....		34,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	+ 45,000,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior.....	816,715,000	853,144,000	908,247,000	907,359,000	910,294,000	+ 93,579,000
(By transfer).....	(-6,563,000)	(-7,168,000)	(-7,168,000)	(-7,168,000)	(-7,168,000)	(-605,000)
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities:						
Operating expenses.....	2,527,267,000	2,702,102,000	2,731,484,000	2,818,216,000	2,802,840,000	+ 275,553,000
Plant and capital equipment.....	488,508,000	454,070,000	436,170,000	431,070,000	421,070,000	- 67,436,000
Total.....	3,015,793,000	3,156,172,000	3,167,654,000	3,249,286,000	3,223,910,000	- 208,117,000
Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities:						
Operating expenses.....	1,202,457,000	246,992,000	160,000,000	246,992,000	246,992,000	- 955,465,000
Plant and capital equipment.....	83,863,000	100,000		100,000	100,000	- 83,763,000
Subtotal.....	1,286,320,000	247,092,000	160,000,000	247,092,000	247,092,000	- 1,039,228,000
Gross revenues.....	-1,482,000,000	-70,000,000		-70,000,000	-70,000,000	+ 1,392,000,000
Net appropriation.....	-175,680,000	177,092,000	160,000,000	177,092,000	177,092,000	+ 352,772,000
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund.....		286,320,000	286,320,000	286,320,000	286,320,000	+ 286,320,000
General Science and Research Activities:						
Operating expenses.....	726,162,000	781,264,000	719,785,000	835,187,000	799,187,000	+ 73,025,000
Plant and capital equipment.....	691,622,000	804,927,000	474,329,000	779,927,000	815,927,000	+ 124,305,000
Total.....	1,417,784,000	1,586,191,000	1,194,114,000	1,615,114,000	1,615,114,000	+ 197,330,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund.....	275,071,000	258,028,000	260,000,000	260,000,000	260,000,000	- 15,071,000
Isotope production and distribution fund.....	5,000,000	3,686,000	3,910,000	3,910,000	3,910,000	- 1,090,000
Environmental Restoration and Waste Management:						
Defense function.....	(4,831,547,000)	(5,428,112,000)	(5,185,877,000)	(5,106,855,000)	(5,181,855,000)	(+ 350,308,000)
Non-defense function.....	(709,894,000)	(1,003,798,000)	(1,003,798,000)	(1,003,798,000)	(1,003,798,000)	(+ 294,104,000)
Total.....	(5,541,241,000)	(6,431,910,000)	(6,189,875,000)	(6,110,653,000)	(6,185,653,000)	(+ 644,412,000)
Atomic Energy Defense Activities						
Weapons Activities:						
Operating expenses.....	4,010,209,000	3,350,848,000	3,244,858,000	3,248,930,000	3,248,856,000	- 761,553,000
Plant and capital equipment.....	558,540,000	358,652,000	327,542,000	348,552,000	348,542,000	- 211,998,000
Total.....	4,568,749,000	3,709,500,000	3,572,399,000	3,597,482,000	3,597,398,000	- 973,551,000
Defense Environmental Restoration & Waste Management:						
Operating expenses.....	4,074,490,000	4,787,513,000	4,485,813,000	4,537,278,000	4,552,278,000	+ 477,788,000
Plant and capital equipment.....	757,057,000	680,599,000	720,264,000	599,577,000	629,577,000	- 127,480,000
Total.....	4,831,547,000	5,468,112,000	5,185,877,000	5,106,855,000	5,181,855,000	+ 350,308,000

FY 1994 ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2445), continued

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Materials Support and Other Defense Programs:						
Operating expenses.....	2,227,802,000	1,808,970,000	1,729,283,000	1,854,246,000	1,854,246,000	-573,356,000
Plant and capital equipment.....	390,727,000	336,278,000	317,306,000	309,509,000	309,509,000	-81,218,000
Total.....	2,618,529,000	2,145,248,000	2,046,589,000	1,963,755,000	1,963,755,000	-654,574,000
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal.....	100,000,000	119,742,000	120,000,000	120,000,000	120,000,000	+20,000,000
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities.....	12,118,625,000	11,402,402,000	10,924,867,000	10,788,092,000	10,860,808,000	-1,257,817,000
Departmental Administration:						
Operating expenses.....	397,878,000	405,922,000	393,458,000	393,458,000	393,458,000	-4,418,000
Plant and capital equipment.....	7,780,000	8,561,000	7,780,000	7,780,000	7,780,000	
Subtotal.....	405,658,000	414,483,000	401,238,000	401,238,000	401,238,000	-4,418,000
Miscellaneous revenues.....	-318,361,000	-239,209,000	-239,209,000	-239,209,000	-239,209,000	+79,172,000
Net appropriation.....	87,275,000	175,274,000	162,029,000	162,029,000	162,029,000	+74,754,000
Office of the Inspector General.....	30,362,000	31,757,000	31,757,000	30,362,000	30,362,000	
Power Marketing Administrations						
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration.....	3,577,000	4,010,000	4,010,000	4,010,000	4,010,000	+433,000
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration.....	32,411,000	29,742,000	29,742,000	29,742,000	29,742,000	-2,669,000
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration.....	21,907,000	33,587,000	33,587,000	33,587,000	33,587,000	+11,680,000
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration.....	326,834,000	352,956,000	292,956,000	277,956,000	277,956,000	-48,678,000
(By transfer, permanent authority).....	(6,563,000)	(7,168,000)	(7,168,000)	(7,168,000)	(7,168,000)	(+605,000)
Total, Power Marketing Administrations.....	364,529,000	420,295,000	360,295,000	345,295,000	345,295,000	-39,234,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission						
Salaries and expenses.....	158,639,000	165,375,000	165,375,000	165,375,000	165,375,000	+6,736,000
Revenues Applied.....	-158,639,000	-165,375,000	-165,375,000	-165,375,000	-165,375,000	-6,736,000
Total, title III, Department of Energy.....	17,158,756,000	17,497,397,000	16,550,726,000	16,917,500,000	16,964,840,000	-193,919,000
(By transfer).....	(6,563,000)	(7,168,000)	(7,168,000)	(7,168,000)	(7,168,000)	(+605,000)
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
Appalachian Regional Commission.....	190,000,000	189,000,000	189,000,000	249,000,000	249,000,000	+59,000,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.....	13,000,000	15,080,000	15,080,000	18,080,000	16,580,000	+3,500,000
Delaware River Basin Commission:						
Salaries and expenses.....	325,000	333,000	333,000	333,000	333,000	+8,000
Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission.....	475,000	488,000	488,000	488,000	488,000	+13,000
Total.....	800,000	821,000	821,000	821,000	821,000	+21,000
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin:						
Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.....	485,000	498,000	498,000	498,000	498,000	+13,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:						
Salaries and expenses.....	535,415,000	542,900,000	542,900,000	542,900,000	542,900,000	+7,485,000
Revenues.....	-514,315,000	-520,900,000	-520,900,000	-520,900,000	-520,900,000	-6,585,000
Subtotal.....	21,100,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	+900,000
Office of Inspector General.....	4,585,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	+215,000
Revenues.....	-4,585,000	-4,800,000	-4,800,000	-4,800,000	-4,800,000	-215,000
Subtotal.....						
Total.....	21,100,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	+900,000
Susquehanna River Basin Commission:						
Salaries and expenses.....	301,000	308,000	308,000	308,000	308,000	+7,000
Contribution to Susquehanna River Basin Commission.....	290,000	298,000	298,000	298,000	298,000	+8,000
Total.....	591,000	606,000	606,000	606,000	606,000	+15,000
Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Authority Fund.....	136,000,000	138,973,000	138,973,000	140,473,000	140,473,000	+5,473,000
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board.....	2,080,000	2,180,000	2,180,000	2,180,000	2,180,000	+100,000
Office of the Nuclear Waste Negotiator.....		1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+1,000,000
Total, title IV, independent agencies.....	383,036,000	370,118,000	370,118,000	434,618,000	433,118,000	+70,082,000
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority.....	22,240,843,000	22,348,046,000	21,730,444,000	22,192,817,000	22,215,382,000	-25,261,000
(By transfer).....						

□ 1220

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], for the purpose of debate and to yield time as he chooses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, our chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], has explained where we are today and why we are in this condition. Going to conference with the other body is never an easy task. It is not that I am blaming the other body particularly for making it difficult, but a conference is just exactly that, trying to work out differences between the version passed by the House and the version passed by the Senate.

In this particular instance the House conferees were well aware of our responsibility, our charge, that we were obligated, at least morally, to support the House position. I think the House made a wrong decision when 4 months ago it decided to strike the money for the superconducting super collider. It is an expensive experimental vehicle, there is no question about that, but the United States must continue to be on the leading edge on research. If our children and our grandchildren are to continue to be competitive with the rest of the world, we must continue to explore the unknown. Science certainly is an area where we have to continue that research.

However, your conferees felt obligated to defend the House position on the superconducting super collider, which was one which we voted, of course, to eliminate the funds for construction of. I am going to talk about what funds were left in the bill shortly.

Nevertheless, when we went to the conference with the other body, there were some other differences in our bill. Those were more easily resolved than this one. We held the superconducting super collider to the last, and, after discussing it with the Senate in the conference, we broke up for an hour because we were unable to come to any conclusion. So we met separately for an hour, and then we met with them.

The Senate was adamant about retaining the \$640 million that they had placed in the bill for the construction of the superconducting super collider. They said they would not give up on that. They said they had passed it eas-

ily in the Senate and had some votes in the Senate they had not used. So we were in a position where we were unable to resolve this.

After some considerable discussion with the other body, we came to the conclusion that we would go along with them and bring it back to the House, which is what we have done today.

Now, where are we today with the superconducting super collider? We know that the Government has spent a little over \$2 billion at this site in Texas to build this superconducting super collider. We know that Texas has pledged \$1 billion. We are not certain about some other foreign contributions. But we have built about 20 percent of the superconducting super collider. That much is completed at this point.

We also know the termination costs would be very expensive. We are unable to determine for certain how much those costs would be, but it is estimated to be more than \$1 billion. So if we were to decide today or at some point in the future not to complete the superconducting super collider, we know we are going to have approximately \$3 to \$3½ billion invested in this and have absolutely nothing to show but a scar, a hole in the ground, and some buildings that have been built. So the termination of this would be expensive to the taxpayer also.

To complete this, we do not know exactly what it will cost, but there have been estimates as high as \$11 billion. Secretary O'Leary in the Department of Energy has written us a letter today explaining she is trying to determine those costs. I do not think from the estimates we have been given by her that it will run that high, but we know it will run higher than approximately \$8½ billion.

So the Congress today is faced with a situation, do we terminate this and have absolutely nothing left to show for it, or do we continue to build a science vehicle which in the next century will be probably very valuable to the United States?

But make no misunderstanding: If we do not go along with what the conferees have come back with, we will not be saving any money. The House, incidentally, put \$220 million in our version for termination costs when it passed this. Assuming it is going to take at least that much next year and more for future years, we will absolutely save no money whatsoever and have nothing to show for it.

I did not sign the conference report because I did feel obligated to defend the House position, even though I do think the House position was wrong. Nevertheless, we will have absolutely nothing to show for this. We will not save any money.

The \$640 million the Senate put in, if we take it out and the conference comes back, make no mistake about it,

that money will be spent some other way, somewhere else. So those who think you will be saving money for the taxpayer by defeating the superconducting super collider today are wrong. No money will be saved.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER].

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member of the authorizing committee on several water projects in this legislation, I rise to commend the chairman and the distinguished ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to address provisions in the conference report on H.R. 2445, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1994. I particularly want to express strong support for various water resources projects and programs of the Army Corps of Engineers funded throughout the bill.

First, let me commend the conferees for their efforts. From the beginning, they have cooperated with the Public Works and Transportation Committee, the House's authorizing committee for corps' water resources programs. I especially want to thank members of the House Appropriations Committee. They have worked closely with me and others on the Public Works Committee to include funding to address not only the Nation's water infrastructure needs but those in Pennsylvania, as well.

The conference report includes \$10 million for a critically needed environmental infrastructure and resource development program for south central Pennsylvania. The project, authorized in section 313 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992, would help the corps meet various environmental and economic needs of rural communities. As one of the provision's primary drafters, I can assure members that our intent was for the corps to accelerate normal procedures to get to actual construction as soon as possible.

The conference agreement is consistent with our intent regarding the section 313 program. It is also consistent with language from the House Appropriations Committee report—on H.R. 2445—describing how funds should be spent.

While it provides only \$10 million of the \$17 million authorized, it will help to get the corps moving in the right direction—beyond preliminary study and planning and swiftly into project construction and implementation. This is not merely study money; it is money to get various projects up and running. While \$10 million is less than I had hoped for, \$5 million for each of the Chesapeake Bay and Ohio River watersheds will be helpful in meeting the region's enormous needs.

It is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that the conferees specifically rejected the Senate's approach to funding and implementation of the south central Pennsylvania program. The Senate bill had provided only \$700,000—barely enough to get the program moving beyond the conceptual stage and certainly not enough to get it moving quickly toward construction. The conferees, however, adopted the House's approach of providing a significant amount of funds from the construction general account to move the program into construction in fiscal

year 1994. Therefore, the intent is clear: This program is not to be constrained by drawn-out studies or lengthy preconstruction delays.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not thank Congressman JOHN MURTHA for the invaluable role he has played in both authorizing and appropriating funds for the south central Pennsylvania program. We worked together on the provision in the 1992 act and again in the drafting of funding provisions in this legislation. I appreciate his leadership and help.

I also appreciate the Appropriations Committee's willingness to address other water resources issues in south central Pennsylvania. For example, the conference report provides \$400,000 for a watershed reclamation and wetlands pilot project for the broad top region. Also, it appropriates \$450,000 for the corps to initiate a comprehensive study of the Juniata River corridor, including a reevaluation of the flood control needs of Tyrone, PA.

To avoid any possible confusion, I should also clarify our intent regarding the Juniata River basin study. The Senate bill included only \$250,000—rather than \$450,000 as in the House bill—and limited the scope of the study to just the Tyrone component. The conference agreement, adopting the House's approach, provides \$450,000 for the Juniata River basin, including the Tyrone component.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have had the opportunity to clarify some of the provisions in the conference report. I appreciate the work of the conferees, not only as it pertains to Pennsylvania but also to the entire Nation's water resources and environmental infrastructure.

□ 1230

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. HUGHES]. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], who is a key member of this subcommittee.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 2445.

This bill is about our future. It is about being prepared to meet the energy, water, and scientific challenges of the next century. And, it is about being a leader in our world community and here at home.

This bill is about remaining a world leader in high energy physics, that is true. The SSC, however, is only part of that story. There is funding in the bill for the B Factory which will keep this Nation on the leading edge of electron physics and keep the bay area of California a leading center for advanced technologies. There is money in the bill for the main injector at Fermi Lab. Fermi Lab has the highest energy proton colliding beam facility in the world. And with the main injector, Fermi Lab will remain a leader for the foreseeable future.

The conference report also puts our country firmly on a path to resume our position of world leadership in renewable energy technologies. The bill pro-

vides a significant boost to each and every renewable energy technology. With enactment of the bill, the Department of Energy will boldly and aggressively help move these technologies forward. The solar and renewable technologies represent the future of energy production, energy production without environmental degradation.

The conference report is also about the future safety of our people and their property. The bill includes over \$4 billion in water resource projects in every State and every region of the country. This past summer we saw the devastation that can be wrought by flooding. We saw communities under water and property swept away. This bill is the cornerstone of our Federal efforts to look to the future and moves us in the direction of preventing similar tragedies all across this Nation.

If you have a flood threat or a water resource problem in your district, this bill no doubt provides the only hope of future relief.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill is about setting priorities and living within one's means. We have provided funding for the key energy, science, and water projects, and we have done so within our subcommittee allocation. We are under the President's budget request, under the 602(b) allocation, and under the amount appropriated last year. This is a fiscally restrained bill. We have lived within our limits. We have done our job, and each Member of the House can be proud of that.

This bill is about looking ahead, about making our economy stronger and our communities safer. I strongly urge a yes vote on the conference report.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the conferees on the Missouri River mitigation project and other water projects.

Mr. Speaker, this Member would like to express his strong opposition to the conferees decision to again ignore the will of the House of Representatives by restoring \$640 million in funding for the superconducting super collider [SSC]. It would be acceptable to fund this massive project if we had the resources, and if it did not delay or prevent other valuable research and development projects; however, despite any assurances to the contrary, that obviously is not the case.

Last year, this Member and others voted in a bipartisan effort to cut funding for the superconducting super collider. Nevertheless, Senate and House conferees ignored this important House mandate and restored funding for the project in the House/Senate compromise legislation. This year, the House again voted overwhelmingly—280 to 150—to kill funding for the SSC, but regrettably, conferees have repeated their indifference to the will of the majority of the House by restoring funding for this enormous project.

This Member has consistently opposed funding for the SSC because it is a project we simply cannot afford. The massive amount of funds the SSC project requires—undoubtedly underestimated like all huge, public works and science projects—will drain funds from other worthy science and research and development programs. In its report entitled, "SSC is Over Budget and Behind Schedule," the GAO notes that 6 years the Department of Energy [DOE] has increased its estimated cost of the SSC project from \$5.3 to \$8.25 billion. Now, GAO reports—and the Department of Energy recognizes—that cost estimates for the SSC may exceed \$11 billion. Mr. Speaker, this Member regrets that this conference report includes funding for the SSC.

Nevertheless, this Member recognizes that the 1994 Energy and Water Development Appropriations conference report for fiscal year 1994 includes funding for several related water projects that are important to many parts of our Nation.

Importantly, the conference report commendably provides funding for two Missouri River projects which are designed to remedy problems of erosion, loss of fish and wildlife habitat, and sedimentation. First, the bill provides \$11.8 million for the Missouri River mitigation project. This funding is needed to restore fish and wildlife habitat lost due to the federally sponsored channelization and stabilization projects of the Pick-Sloan era. The islands, wetlands, and flat floodplains needed to support the wildlife and waterfowl that once lived along the river largely have been eliminated through the stabilization of the Missouri River. An estimated 475,000 acres of habitat in Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, and Kansas have been lost. Today's fishery resources are estimated to be only one-fifth of those which existed prior to the channelization of these stretches of the river.

Second, the conference report provides \$200,000 for operation and maintenance and \$74,000 for construction of the Missouri National Recreation River project. This project addresses a serious problem in protecting the river banks from the extraordinary and excessive erosion rates caused by the sporadic and varying releases from the Gavins Point Dam. These large erosion rates are a direct result of previous work on the river by the Federal Government.

In addition, the conference report provides funding for the continuation of several studies important to residents of Nebraska's First Congressional District. It provides continued funding for a floodplain study of the Antelope Creek which runs through the heart of Nebraska's capital city, Lincoln, and it enables the completion of a flood control study of the Burt Water Drainage District in Burt and Washington Counties.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this Member recognizes that the conference report also provides operation and maintenance funding for the Missouri River Water Control Manual as well as funding for Army Corps and Bureau of Reclamation projects in Nebraska's other two congressional districts at the following sites: Wood River; Papillion Creek and Tributaries Lakes; Gavins Point Dam, Lewis and Clark Lake; Harlan County Lake; Salt Creek and tributaries; Prairie Bend and North Loup Division.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes and 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, in just a few minutes there will be a motion to recommit this measure with instructions to terminate funding for the superconducting super collider. This is the most important and most significant test of this body's will to cut unnecessary spending that we will face all year.

The SSC really is not the issue here. The House has already spoken out loud and clear. We voted 280 to 150 to kill the SSC in June, because we felt that we could not afford the project. And what has happened since then?

The Secretary of Energy has raised the cost estimate for the project another \$3 billion. It keeps going up and up and up. It started at \$4.4 billion. Then it went to \$5.9 billion, and we are talking about the taxpayers' money. Then it was up to \$8.2 billion. Now it is up over \$11 billion. And the end is not yet in sight.

She has also said she will make sure that the Department will stick to the \$11 billion figure. We have heard that one before. Our previous Secretary of Energy said that, not one dime over \$5.9 billion.

We are up over \$11 billion. The collider is not the issue. The issue is whether House Members are willing to stick to their guns or be sabotaged by a small group of Appropriations conferees. The issue is whether we are going to continue to conduct business as usual in this Chamber or whether we are going to change in a way that will reduce the deficit. If we are going to be honest with the American people, that is the issue. The issue is whether the House is a genuine legislative body or merely a very expensive version of Boys' State, just going through the motions of governing and leaving the real decisions to others.

Our motion today will be very targeted. We are going to be very precise. It will save at least \$9 billion, my colleagues. We have an opportunity to save \$9 billion for the taxpayers.

That can only help other programs, despite the propaganda one hears from the proponents. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] says we will not save any money this year if we terminate the \$640 million for the collider, because it will go to other projects. Sure, it will go to other projects, worthy projects. But next year and the year after that and the year after that, \$9 billion. That is a day's work well done.

I urge my colleagues to vote their conscience and vote with the American people.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to commend my friend, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], and the ranking

minority member. They have been fair in the way they have dealt with us on this issue. I appreciate that. I thank them for the time that they have given us here today.

Mr. Speaker, 280 Members voted earlier this year, nearly two-thirds on both sides of the political aisle, to terminate funding for the superconducting super collider. That is up from 232 last year.

In the other body, last year, 32 Senators voted to terminate funding for the super collider. This year there were 42 Members who voted "no."

My colleagues, it is clear that the tide is running in our favor. As Members learn more about the super collider, more Members in this body and in the other body do not think it is a good way to spend the taxpayers' money. I hope that we keep that in mind as we vote here today.

We are talking about real money. As has already been pointed out, \$9 to \$10 billion can be saved for the American taxpayers by eliminating the super collider. So when my friends say we are not going to save very much money, I disagree; \$9 to \$10 billion is a lot of money.

And to boil this down so that we can understand precisely what this means to our States, we have prepared a printout to show Members, State by State, what the super collider will cost them.

California taxpayers, listen up. This project is going to cost California taxpayers \$1.5 billion; Georgia taxpayers, \$254 million; Illinois taxpayers, \$572 million; Kansas taxpayers, \$103 million. That is our share of this super collider project. Michigan taxpayers, \$405 million; and New York taxpayers, \$940 million. That is their State's share of what this monstrosity is going to cost us.

I cannot explain that nor justify it to my taxpayers, and I do not believe my colleagues can explain it and justify it for their taxpayers.

Let me review just some of the basic reasons why more and more of our colleagues on both sides of the political aisle in both Houses of the Congress are now coming to our point of view.

First of all, the cost, as Members have already heard. We were told it was going to cost \$4.4 billion. Wrong. The cost estimate then went up to \$5.9 billion and then \$8.25 billion, then to \$11 billion, and now some people are saying it is going to cost \$13 billion. And now the Secretary of Energy tells us, "We don't know what it is going to cost. We will tell you next June, and we will establish a baseline at that time, and we may even recommend terminating it at that time, if we can't build it for what they think we should be able to build it for."

Are we going to continue to be big suckers or not?

Now, in addition to that, we were told that we were going to get \$1.7 bil-

lion in foreign contributions. We could not find enough suckers around the world to step up.

□ 1240

Today, Mr. Speaker, we have \$65 million in the bank from people that probably depend upon us for foreign aid to help fund this project. We do not have anywhere near the \$1.7 billion, and we are not going to get it.

Last year the chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology stood here in the well and said, "If we do not have those foreign contributions, I will oppose the project." I would say to the Members, we do not have those contributions. It is time to stand by our word for a change.

The next point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is this is the largest single cut in any appropriation bill. I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is time for this body and all the people in this body and the other body also to do something real to cut spending for the taxpayers of this country. We have all said we want to do it. Now we have a chance today to do it.

Two hundred and eighty of us here have already said we do not want to spend money for the SSC. The only reason, Members would flip-flop and vote differently today is because they are worried about a little bit of money in this bill for their districts. This is log-rolling. This is pork barreling. It is the very thing that the taxpayers are absolutely livid about.

I urge my colleagues who are thinking about flip-flopping not to do that. I would say to these Members, their project is not in jeopardy if they stand on their principles and vote the way they did earlier this year.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLO], a very valued member of this subcommittee.

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2445 making appropriations for energy and water development for fiscal year 1994. As a member of this subcommittee, I would like to thank Chairman BEVILL and ranking member JOHN MYERS for their leadership. I would also like to thank the subcommittee and minority staff: Hunter Spillan, Bob Schmidt, Aaron Edmondson, Lori Whipp, Jeanne Wilson, Michelle Mrdeza, and Doug Wasitis for their expertise and knowledge on these important issues.

This year, as appropriators, we had a difficult task balancing our Nation's energy and water needs due to the fact of tight budget restraints. Even though this is not a perfect report, it is one that will continue to move this country toward energy independence and help to provide the technology base that the United States has enjoyed in the past.

This year's conference report is \$132 million below the President's request

and \$89 million below last year's bill. The subcommittee worked very hard to stay within its 602(b) allocation.

With this conference report we have made a significant long-term commitment to the development of new energy sources for our future needs. Often times we find it very difficult to look to the future for our energy needs. However, we must make the commitment now. We must provide the economic opportunities today. Without this investment we are dooming our future generations to a lower standard of living and less productive lives.

I believe this report takes the necessary step. Within this report we have funded programs that will make this country less dependent on foreign sources of energy. We have funded scientific research that will give us the edge and the capability to take this country into the 21st century.

I am also pleased that the committee increased funding for renewable energy sources. In particular, the committee provided important funding for our solar/photovoltaics and wind programs. The investment in these technologies will allow our country to become the leader in this field.

I also rise today in support of funding contained in the fiscal year 1994 energy and water development appropriations conference agreement for the fusion energy program. I want to express my sincere appreciation to Chairman BEVILL and my colleague Mr. MYERS for their leadership in the area of fusion research and for working with me to secure a fair funding level for all aspects of the program in fiscal year 1994.

I know my colleagues will agree that energy technology development is one of the most important scientific investments that we can make for the future. The outstanding work that is being done by the U.S. fusion research community—in concert with international partners—is a true testament to the application of science and technology to one of the country's most vexing problems: The development of environmentally sensitive energy alternatives for the future. Energy supply limitations, national security considerations, and environmental factors demand that we continue this promising investment.

There is little doubt that the demand for energy will increase significantly over the next few decades as the world population grows and as undeveloped countries gain the tools of economic development. We know that existing power stations are aging and will need replacing. To replace these facilities and to keep pace with the increases in energy demands worldwide, we will need central station power electricity. Generating that much energy without assaulting the environment is one of the most difficult challenges facing our world. Energy research is exactly the kind of investment the Federal Govern-

ment should be making now, and fusion must be part of our investment strategy. Fusion has the advantage of deriving its fuel from ordinary water. Two inches of Lake Erie could produce more energy through fusion than all the energy in the world's oil reserves. With fusion, we would never run out of fuel and we would never have to go to war for it. There is no acid rain associated with fusion, no greenhouse gases, and fusion's basic waste product is ordinary inert helium gas.

Progress in fusion research and the contributions of plasma physics have been substantial. We are now on the brink of realizing some of the benefits of fusion research, and I am proud that New Jersey plays a leadership role in fusion development. At the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, scientists are preparing to embark on a series of historic experiments this winter that will set world records in fusion power production. In addition, a national team of scientists and engineers are designing the next generation advanced fusion device that will be built at Princeton, and I am pleased that the conferees included a total of \$20 million in the conference agreement for the design of this machine, the Tokamak Physics Experiment [TPX].

I am also pleased that this detailed design work will include industrial participation in engineering design and research and development. It is time that industrial partners begin playing an active and strong role in the U.S. fusion program. The Secretary of Energy has assured me that the design contracts will be consistent with standard, phased industrial contracts with options for construction that would permit continuity and allow the project—if it should be approved in the future—to be completed in the most efficient and cost-effective manner.

TPX will push the frontiers of fusion technology in areas like superconducting magnets, low temperature cryogenic systems, nonradioactive materials, and robotics for remote maintenance. TPX's mission is unique in the world fusion program, and it is a smart step for the U.S. fusion program because it will help American industry build more efficient, smaller fusion power reactors. I want these machines to read "Made in the U.S.A." and TPX will help get American industry trained and experienced in fusion technology.

Another very exciting component of the U.S. fusion program is our participation in the international collaboration known as ITER, the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor. We are breaking new ground with ITER by working with our partners from the start on this important step in fusion development. Our partners in ITER realize the great potential for fusion energy and the Japanese and European investments in fusion now surpass our

own. The Japanese and European programs have the benefit of strong industry involvement. America should move expeditiously to identify a site for ITER, and we should build our industrial base so that American workers can benefit from this exciting energy alternative and future energy markets.

Let me add that I agree with my colleague in the Senate, Chairman JOHNSTON, on the need for ITER negotiations to take a very high priority within the administration. Fusion has always been a bipartisan effort, and I was very pleased that the new administration considers fusion—TPX and ITER in particular—high priority investments. ITER started with Presidents Reagan and Gorbachev; the engineering design protocol was signed under President Bush; and now it is up to the new administration to take ITER a step further—host site identification. The executive branch—the President, his science adviser, the Office of Management and Budget, the State Department—need to move ITER and fusion to the top of their agenda so that progress doesn't stall. ITER negotiations are complicated and time-consuming, and we must continue the good progress that has been made. Congress must continue to do its part, too. The Senate has passed an authorization bill this year, and I will be working with my colleagues to pass a bill in the House as soon as possible.

Attached to my statement is a copy of a recent letter from the Secretary of Energy to Chairman JOHNSTON and Senator HATFIELD about TPX and the importance of moving ahead with design work in fiscal year 1994. The letter illustrates the important role of TPX in the U.S. fusion, and it underscores the importance of TPX to the international fusion program. ITER is a big step forward, but it isn't a smart step without TPX. We need TPX to make ITER and a fusion demonstration reactor smarter and more efficient. The Department of Energy and fusion scientists in this country have mapped out a long-term strategy to develop fusion energy. TPX is the next major domestic step in that plan. When we build TPX at Princeton, it will be the first major fusion machine built in this country since the 1970's. When we turn TPX on early in the next century, it will be the only major fusion device operating in this country.

Our investment in fusion is already paying off. The money is well invested and wisely spent—on an energy source for future generations that is cleaner, safer and more easily available. At the Princeton laboratory last week, one of the scientists—Dr. Russell Hulse—won a Nobel prize in physics for work that he did almost 20 years ago as a graduate student. Steady progress in fusion energy will pay off, too. Just as Hulse's work on astrophysics that began almost 20 years ago lead to a Nobel prize

this year, so too will his work and the work of others in this promising field led to practical fusion power.

In addition, this report provides funding for a number of critical flood control projects throughout the United States. This year was a grim reminder of the devastation that occurs when mother nature lashes out. This has been one of the worse years in U.S. history for flooding.

The projects contained in this report will help to prevent property damage and loss of life in areas with recognized flooding problems. But even more important, this report includes projects that will prevent floods from occurring. The proper planning done by the Army Corps of Engineers has proven to be very effective. Even with the devastating floods that occurred in the Midwest this year, Federal levees and dikes held. The Army Corps is to be commended for their dedication and hard work.

This is a good conference report. Preparing for our future needs is never easy, but H.R. 2445 provides the insight and programs that will make it a little easier. I urge the adoption of this important report.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a letter to Senator J. BENNETT JOHNSTON, September 22, 1993, from Secretary O'Leary:

THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY,

Washington, DC., September 22, 1993.

Hon. J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Energy, and Water Development, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is a follow up to a meeting held September 8, 1993, in which you were briefed by the Department on our plans for United States participation in the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor program. The Department of Energy regards the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor as setting a standard of excellence for carrying out a collaborative international scientific endeavor, and we appreciate your interest and support.

I understand there was a candid and productive discussion of this program. However, my staff also reported that you see a need to delay our domestic initiative, the Tokamak Physics Experiment, until international agreement has been reached on beginning construction of the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor.

We strongly urge you to support our full \$20 million request for continued design of the Tokamak Physics Experiment for the following reasons:

(1) The Tokamak Physics Experiment constitutes a forward-looking step for the United States fusion program and addresses issues in improved tokamak design and pulse length that go beyond the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor mission. It represents an experimental focus for the United States fusion program at the beginning of the next century when existing experiments will have been fully exploited.

(2) The Tokamak Physics Experiment has been conceived in such a way that it will be able to provide critical guidance for the operation of the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor. The size and scale of the International Thermonuclear Experi-

mental Reactor enterprise as such that operational improvements derived from the tokamak design could save time and money.

(3) Another objective in the Tokamak Physics Experiment is to bring United States industry into the project very early in the design phase, in part to incorporate industrial manufacturing knowledge, but more importantly to provide an opportunity for technology transfer as the United States prepares to participate in the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor construction. Also, some of the technologies concerned, such as superconductivity, robotics, and computer control systems, have relevance beyond fusion.

(4) The proposed fiscal year 1994 budget of \$20 million for the Tokamak Physics Experiment already constitutes a minimal start on preliminary design activities for the project. These funds are needed in order to continue the present design efforts, to bring industrial contractors into the design team, and to begin research and development that is needed to validate the design concepts.

From the beginning, the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor was designed to ensure equal participation from the four partners. With this concept of parity and shared responsibility, it represents an international endeavor that is already breaking new ground on both technical and political horizons. However, international agreement to begin construction will take considerable time even with the best intentions of all the participants.

The Tokamak Physics Experiment, on the other hand, is ready to move forward, and I urge that we continue the design process. This experiment will provide the United States with the technical basis to be a productive partner in a future international fusion program. Failure to proceed with the Tokamak Physics Experiment at this time will be perceived as a sign of weak resolve on the part of the United States fusion program and, thereby, will undercut our participation in the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor.

Again, the Department values your continued support of the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor project.

Sincerely,

HAZEL R. O'LEARY.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], a senior member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] was most eloquent in stating why this conference report should be voted down. The fact is that in 1990 this House, through the passage of legislation, set a base line of a maximum contribution of \$5 billion for the superconducting super collider. It is now quite evident that the total Federal contribution, in order to get this job done, will be way, way over the amount because of the failure of the super collider management to accurately assess what the costs were, a lack of leadership by the Department of Energy, in both the Clinton and Bush administrations, to level with the public and with the Congress on how much this would cost, as well as an abject failure to get any foreign contributions that amount to anything.

The time has come to put the lid on further expenditures. We are hemorrhaging expenditures in superconducting super collider. This project does not deserve another year's grace by the Congress continuing to appropriate it. The only way parliamentarily that we will be able to stop expenditures for the SSC is to recommit this conference report, either with or without instructions, to the committee on conference, and for this House to give the message loud and clear to the conferees that they have got to ax the costs for the superconducting super collider if they wish to get this conference report passed.

I do not think anybody's pet project is in jeopardy, for those who want to be consistent in voting against the super collider. The time has come to say, "Enough is enough on this project." We are going to have to stand up, be tall, be consistent, and be counted on the motion to recommit.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I notice that people are against the project as pork barrel, and it has a lot of problems, and we do not really talk about the project, we just talk about all the excesses.

One of the things I would like to point out, and I think it is important, when I went out there to visit this project, and I was concerned before I went to visit it, I was not sure exactly what the focus of the project was. After talking to the scientists and after thinking about what had happened from, say, SDI, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] said to me the other day the valuable, phenomenal communications results that we see today have all come from SDI.

I know it is tough to vote for R&D when the budget is so tough, but I would hope that the Members today would consider how important this type of basic research is to the country, and I would hope that they would support this conference report, which has been so delicately worked out.

We did the same thing last year. The Senate passed it and we defeated it. I hope that the Senate will prevail this time.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], a member of the Subcommittee on Technology, Environment and Aviation of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, today we are debating the superconducting super collider and we are also debating the budget. We are debating the level of deficit spending this country will have.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about an \$11 billion project. What is the purpose of this \$11 billion project? When we

have interviewed the scientists on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the answers I get from them is, "We are spending this money to achieve a better understanding of the universe," \$11 billion for a better understanding of the universe.

With the \$11 billion spent on this project, we could build a fusion energy plant that would develop this new technology and give something real to mankind. We could develop technology that would make the air cleaner or our lives better, or we could bring down the level of deficit spending by not spending the money. This country is already spending \$300 billion more per year than we are taking in. Talk about being doomed, we are doomed, our economy is doomed, if we cannot get ourselves to say no to projects like this that are totally unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, I say vote "no" on the motion and vote "no" on the super collider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUGHES). The Chair would advise the Members that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] has 12 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] has 10 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] has 6 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], a senior Member of this House and of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished floor manager of the bill. As the gentleman knows, the House committee report on the bill references a decision pending before the Department of Energy on whether to transfer certain highly enriched uranium fuel from the Portsmouth, OH, uranium enrichment facility to Oak Ridge, TN. The language notes the committee's concern about the effects of a transfer on the Portsmouth facility's employees and urges that, in the event of a transfer, retraining and relocation services should be provided to the affected employees. In light of that language, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Was it the committee's and the conferees' understanding that, notwithstanding the concern expressed, the decision on whether to transfer the fuel would be left to the Department of Energy and that the Department is to make that decision taking into account all relevant factors, including the impact of the decision on employment in both Ohio and Tennessee?

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUILLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that that was, indeed, our intention.

Mr. QUILLEN. As I understand it, then, it was neither the committee's nor the conferees' intent to attempt to influence the department's decision on whether a transfer should be made. Is that correct?

Mr. BEVILL. The gentleman is correct. The intent was to be neutral on that question and to leave it to the Department to make the decision based on all relevant public policy considerations.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

□ 1250

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, earlier this summer I stood in this Chamber and spoke about Jurassic pork, the superconducting super collider. This House voted overwhelmingly, 280 to 141, to kill funding for the SSC. That vote represented the single largest spending cut in any appropriation bill this year.

Unfortunately, because of parliamentary trickery, this Jurassic pork is far from being extinct. Congressman DINGELL and the Energy and Commerce Committee's Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee held hearings on the incredible waste of the SSC. Witness after witness after witness came in and talked about huge cost overruns, and fraud, and abuse, and waste in this, the largest pork project in this Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am part of the freshman class which ran for Congress pledging to cut government waste. We can go home in our districts and talk about cutting a nickel here and a dime here and a little here and a little there, but, Mr. Speaker, voting no on this project is the way to send a message that we in fact are serious about cutting waste. If we mean it, it is time to put up or shut up.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], a member of this subcommittee.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that this whole debate is focusing on just the SSC. This conference report contains many, many items that are so important to this Nation's energy and water resources. We are looking to the future in this bill.

This committee did a good job. The conference report is fair. But if we want to talk about the SSC, let us talk about some of the potentials out of this program. Everybody wants instant gratification with everything we do. We want this thing to pay off right now, basic research or no.

The fact is, ladies and gentlemen, we have some instant payoffs in the SSC. A very small grant was given to the Florida State University to develop some provisions for the SSC, and from that came a very unique plastic tubing that is now being used within the health industry for heart defects. We are saving big dollars. This is a great project. Let us vote for it.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO], who has worked very closely with this committee on a number of energy projects.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Speaker, many of those who have stood in opposition to this bill today have talked about the fact that the SSC represents the largest single cut in the budget. The previous speaker mentioned, however, that there are many things in this budget, and the point I want to focus on is as we talk about cuts in this budget or any other budget, let us talk seriously about the budget process.

Right now, no matter what we do, whether we vote to cut this funding regarding the SSC or any other project, the money does not go to relieving the deficit. The money goes right back into the conference committee for spending on other projects. Under our budget system, a cut does not eliminate the baseline amount of money allocated under the 302(b) or 602(b) allocations.

The question here is whether we are going to continue the trend in our budgeting process of eliminating funding for research and development that keeps our country on the leading edge of science in this world. Since 1981, the amount of our budget allocated to R&D has dwindled from about 5 percent now down to about 2½ percent. We have to be ready and able to look forward to the future and we have to listen to the need for having that forward look.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. PASTOR].

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, as we discuss this conference bill, we forget that in this conference report we have some programs that are very environmentally sensitive.

If you vote for this conference report you will be voting for energy conservation. A number of programs that the Department of Energy wants to fund deal with energy conservation.

If Members vote for this conference report they are voting for renewable energy research and development, a 30-percent increase for research on solar energy, a 25-percent increase for geothermal energy, and there is also money for research on wind energy.

We want to get away from depending on foreign oil and foreign energy sources. So this conference report allows us to continue research on renewable energy resources.

If Members vote for this conference report they will be voting to clean up

our environment. Please support the conference report.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to make one quick point.

One of the things that I think has to be driven home here very clearly is that those of us who are rising today to oppose this conference committee report are not opposing other provisions in this bill. Our battle is very simple. It is funding for the super collider. That is what we are trying to kill.

Unfortunately, we have to go through this parliamentary quagmire to get the kind of vote that we want to and send a message again to the other body that we are not in favor of further funding of this project. And that is the point that I think we need to continually drive home.

I do not believe anyone believes that the chairman of our subcommittee is threatening anybody with removal of money from this bill if they vote with us to terminate the super collider.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2445, primarily because it provides billions of dollars for important Corps of Engineers projects, for Bureau of Reclamation projects in the Western States, and billions more for important research funding at the Department of Energy.

If the conference report is defeated, we would be putting in jeopardy funding for vital flood control that is critical to my district, in both Corps of Engineer as well as Department of Energy projects.

Arizona could lose possibly up to \$400 million in projects in this bill. Arkansas could lose \$50 million; California could lose \$200 million; Colorado, \$7 million; Delaware, \$14 million; Florida, \$50 million; Illinois, \$200 million; Ohio, \$15 million; Virginia, \$30 million; and Nebraska could lose \$18 million. The bill actually covers the whole country, but I use these States as examples, and I support their projects. They are meaningful and important projects. The State of Louisiana virtually survives because of them, and we know what happened in the floodways of Middle America this year. These are vital flood projects critically affecting the life and death of individuals who live in and around the waterways of this country. And the Corps of Engineers directly supports them, their livelihoods, and their communities.

I believe that the basic research in this bill is critical to scientific advancement. I support the super collider because I believe that it lays the foundation for intellectual achievement

and prosperity of future generations, and for the development of science in our Nation and this world. I hope it is not defeated.

I know there is a lot of criticism about the project, but I believe it would be a tremendous mistake to defeat the project and beat this bill. Therefore, I urge adoption of the conference report and the defeat of any motion to recommit.

□ 1300

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report and in strong support of the super collider.

As a nation, we must carefully prioritize how we invest and spend our scarce public resources. We must invest wisely, with a careful eye to the future.

I believe the SSC is a very important investment in our future. Once complete, it will enhance our ability to conduct—and benefit from—high-technology research.

Its potential, scientific and economic, is enormous.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the arguments of those who would eliminate the SSC. However, I believe abandoning the super collider now would be a budgetary—and a scientific—mistake.

In fact, we are already beginning to see benefits today from our investment. The work on SSC is currently assisting in the development of our high-technology research capabilities, assisting in vital economic conversion, and helping reposition our defense industries.

I urge my colleagues to support the superconducting super collider.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK], a very outstanding member of this subcommittee.

Mrs. MEEK. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the opponents of this conference report will use terms like "pork barrel," terms like "sabotage;" what they do not understand is the process that it takes to have something pass in this Congress. It takes both sides of this big beautiful facility we have here, both the House and the Senate.

The conferees on this have worked very hard to come to that decision where we can all work together. I want you all to understand, if you do not pass this conference report you will be misled by what you see isolated in one corner, and that is the super collider. The super collider is just one facet of this bill, one facet that they are using as a smokescreen to overcome things we are trying to do for the environment.

When you go back home to run in your district, you tell them that you spoke out against this conference report because it pushed very hard for the environment, that it pushed for

science, that it pushed for research; it pushed for the future of this country.

So, if you can use that one-sided, slanted approach when you go back to your district, you will find out they do not want to hear what the SSC is all about, they want to know whether you voted for the environment, for research, and for the future of this country.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to myself.

I would just like to point out to my colleagues that one of the Nation's leading environmental organizations, Friends of the Earth, is strongly in support of our effort; one of the Nation's leading organizations concerned about the spending practices of Congress, the National Taxpayers Union, four-square in our corner; they want to terminate funding for the SSC.

One of the leading organizations concerned about the activities of Congress, Citizens Against Waste in Government, stands four-square with us.

We are on the side of the American taxpayers. Vote to terminate this project.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST].

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the energy and water appropriations conference report.

Chairman BEVILL and the House conferees have brought back a bill that deserves your support. It includes funding for many important programs and projects benefiting people all across the Nation. I would like to focus for a moment on one of these—the superconducting super collider.

A lot has happened since the House last considered the SSC. Perhaps the most important is the way Secretary of Energy Hazel O'Leary has grabbed the reins and taken control of the project.

Secretary O'Leary announced in August that she was making changes in the way SSC construction is managed in response to concerns raised by the General Accounting Office and others. The changes include bringing in a new construction contractor with world-class business management experience to supplement the scientific capabilities of the present contractor.

Additionally, the Secretary ordered an internal DOE audit team to comprehensively examine the SSC as part of the management initiatives she announced in June. Their report, issued on September 1, confirmed that the project is currently 20 percent complete and that 73 major subcontracts that have been awarded to date have come in at approximately 7 percent under budget.

The report also contains a number of recommendations to help concentrate

attention and resources on the management issues that must be resolved to build the SSC as cost-effectively as possible. Secretary O'Leary is already in the process of implementing measures in response to the report's recommendations.

President Clinton and Secretary O'Leary strongly support the SSC on the basis that it will maintain the position of the United States as the world leader in scientific research. In his recent letter to Chairman Bevill, the President wrote that:

The SSC represents a vital investment in our Nation's ability to maintain its preeminence in basic scientific research and to stimulate the development of new technologies in many areas critical to the health of the U.S. economy.

Mr. Speaker, the project is already 20 percent complete, with \$2 billion having been invested. It would be a tragedy to walk away from a scientifically sound project at this stage.

I urge my colleagues to stand with President Clinton and Secretary O'Leary. They have responded aggressively to the concerns many of you had when the House first considered this issue. They have acted in good faith to take corrective steps to ensure that the SSC is managed efficiently.

The conferees are willing to give the President and Secretary O'Leary a chance—I urge my colleagues to do the same. Please vote for this conference report.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], a new member of the subcommittee, though certainly not a new Member of Congress or of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ROGERS I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word of thanks to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], and the ranking member on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

These two gentlemen have a great collective wisdom about them. They both have served in this House for a great number of years, they both have served as steering partners on this subcommittee for a great number of years, and they know what they are doing. They have taken into account practically every Member of this body in their needs in their own district for either a flood control project or a waterway or a navigation project, operation of a lake, an energy problem, the Appalachian Regional Commission project, or the TVA project. Practically every Member of this body has been to this subcommittee asking something. And practically everybody has been accommodated in one fashion or the other. So there is a lot of collective wisdom in this subcommittee.

I commend the chairman, Mr. BEVILL, and the ranking member, Mr.

MYERS, for all of the hard work they do year-round on this subcommittee. Everybody in this body, indeed the whole country, benefits by the work of this subcommittee.

Now, the gentleman from Indiana, the ranking member, earlier said something about savings to the taxpayers that may or may not come from cutting out the superconducting super collider. I think we are all for cutting wasteful spending, we are all for reducing the deficit. But I say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], if he would join me in a colloquy, is it true that if we cut out the superconducting super collider, we would not be saving the taxpayers any money? Would the gentleman explain that?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I of course yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there will be absolutely nothing saved for the taxpayers. We will spend it on this project or we will spend it on some other project, there is no question about it. I do not know of any time this House has refused to spend money that they have been allocated in a 602(b) allocation.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

First of all, I am amazed by a previous speaker who said that everybody has been accommodated in this bill and, therefore, we should vote for it.

There is no question that a lot of Members have been accommodated. They have been accommodated in an effort to get their votes for the super collider, which is what we are talking about here today. I hope Members are listening to this. We are battling today about whether we are going to spend another \$9 billion to \$10 billion for a project that 280 Members of this body previously voted against and the only reason they can justify flip-flopping now is because they have been accommodated. I hope Members do not sell out for a small project in their districts.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the major debate on this conference report concerns the superconducting super collider, which I strongly support. But while other Members debate this issue, I would like to take a moment to highlight some other important energy science programs which fall under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and which have received strong funding in this conference report.

Energy supply, research, and development programs, which are critically

important in maintaining our energy security and in reducing the environmental impact of energy technologies, receive over \$3.2 billion in this conference report. Included in this funding are both near-term demonstration projects in renewable energy and long-term projects like fusion which promise to supply a substantial portion of our energy needs in the 21st century. I am particularly pleased that the conference report so closely reflects the priorities set by our committee and by the entire Congress last year when we overwhelmingly enacted the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

Let me highlight a few examples of how this report reflects those priorities. The bill increases funding for solar energy programs by over one-third from last year's levels, to a total fiscal year 1994 level of \$252 million. The bill also creates a separate line item for research on hydrogen fuels, which offer great promise for a great variety of environmentally sound energy options in transportation and other areas. Both of these actions are in keeping with the priorities of the Energy Policy Act.

In addition, despite what the critics of the SSC may charge, the bill maintains strong funding for the high-energy physics and nuclear physics programs of the Department. These projects include the FERMI facilities in Illinois, the CEBAF facility in Virginia, and the newly approved B-factory in California, among others.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would ask Members to consider the fact that the conferees have done an excellent job in constraining the growth of earmarked projects throughout the bill. Last year when the energy and water appropriation came back from conference, the bill included 10 earmarked projects worth almost \$100 million. As some of you may recall, I fought to have those projects struck from the bill. Just a few days later, those same projects came back from the defense appropriation's conference revived, fully funded and with a rule that protected them.

This year, the energy and water appropriations bill has come back from conference devoid of earmarks. On top of that, the academic earmarks that can be found in report language are notably smaller than those of the past 2 years. In fiscal year 1992 there were 67 academic earmarks worth \$151 million in the bill and report. Last year, there were 60 academic earmarks worth almost \$177 million in the bill and report. This year, so far as I can discern, there are only 10 academic earmarks worth \$35 million. That represents a four-fifths drop in dollar value from the fiscal year 1993 figures.

While I would be happier if there were no earmarks in the accompanying report, I think the trend is a good one. Mr. Bevill deserves to be commended for his efforts to get academic earmarking under control. I think the

House and the American taxpayer owe him a debt of gratitude for his work this year.

I also want to point out, for the benefit of the Secretary of Energy, that report language is not binding on her agency. The report accompanying this bill is merely advice offered by a handful of Members of the legislative branch. In fact, there were only 10 Members of the House included in the energy and water appropriations conference. This means that only 2 percent of the Representatives in the House had a chance to weigh in on the report language attached to this bill and House rules preclude this body from amending or even voting on that report.

If the Secretary of Energy decides that some of the projects mentioned in the energy and water conference report are not as worthy as the programs she originally intended to fund, it is within her rights to ignore the report language and use funds as she sees fit. She would find this Member and the Science, Space, and Technology Committee would support her in that decision.

Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent conference report, and I urge all Members to support it.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I was inclined to vote against this, but when I heard what the gentleman from Kentucky said—we have not had the rollcall yet—I was just wondering if it is too late to be accommodated? I do not see the gentleman. Maybe he will give me an answer later.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 45 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, on June 17, 1992, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], who chairs the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology asked a rhetorical question. He asked, "Can we afford the super collider?" And he answered his question by saying, and I quote, "Mr. Chairman, after studying this issue closely, my conclusion is, no, not by ourselves. This Nation no longer has the resources to go it alone on a big science project."

The chairman continued by saying, "It has long been apparent that the Federal Government cannot afford to pay the full \$8.2 billion cost of the SSC by itself." That is the chairman's remarks in June 1992.

Well, my friends, there is only one thing that has changed since then, and that is the cost is not \$8.2 billion, it is at least \$11 billion and probably closer to \$13 billion. If we could not afford it at \$8 billion, we darned well cannot afford it at \$13 billion.

□ 1310

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, a previous Member spoke and said that we all want to cut waste and get spending under control. Well, that is hard to believe, because if it were true we would not have seen our national debt go from \$800 billion to \$4,300 billion in just 13 years.

We have a national debt of monumental proportions because Members do not want to cut spending.

In the next 5 years spending will go up 21 percent. The national debt will go up 42 percent, and \$1.8 trillion will be added to the national debt. This can't continue.

We are going to spend \$11 billion on basic research for the superconducting super collider but we cannot own that basic research. We cannot patent it. We can only patent how we commercialize the basic research.

We will have spent our \$11 billion on the research while the Japanese and Western European nations will spend their money on commercializing what we spent a fortune to learn.

I urge my colleagues to realize this is a budget vote. House Members voted 280 to 150 to knock out the SSC on its merits. Now we are dealing with a political process that is not allowing a clear and decisive vote.

The motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] to recommit without instructions obfuscates the whole concept of what the House wants to do. We want a clean vote on the SSC. We need to kill this expensive public works project and not cave into the Senate. Vote to recommit this bill with instructions to support the House position to kill the superconducting super collider. And vote against the Myers motion.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN], a very valued member of this subcommittee.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting in this debate today, we can listen to the opponents of the superconducting super collider not debate the science. They agree the science is good.

We are talking in terms of cost. I think if we put it in terms of cost, we can look at the per capita cost to American citizens of less than 3 cents a year, 3 cents a year to perhaps buy into and complete the most important scientific program in this generation.

We will vote today on whether or not 15,000 Americans are going to lose their jobs. We worry about the North American Free-Trade Agreement and other defense conversions, but a vote to kill the super collider eliminates over 15,000 jobs in America, high tech, science, en-

gineering jobs, destroys the dreams of students in 200 universities across this land, prevents us from doing the kinds of research, as my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, pointed out, that one simple grant has reduced the cost of heart transplants.

My colleagues, heart transplants cost \$5,000 less today because of the superconducting super collider research.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to pass this conference report. We ought to vote for the SSC. We ought to invest in the future of America.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON], who knows more about this project than probably any Member in this Chamber.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report and in even stronger support of the SSC. In the 4½ minutes that I have remaining, I want to go through that project very quickly and I hope very succinctly.

Back in 1982, the U.S. scientific community convened a panel of experts to determine what was necessary to maintain the U.S. preeminence in high energy physics in the world community, which at that time was slipping to the Europeans. The members of this expert panel decided that if it proved to be feasible, we should in fact build the next generation high-energy particle accelerator, which we now know today as the SSC.

Since 1982, numerous panels have reviewed the SSC project, reviewed its concept, reviewed its science, and every panel that has looked at it has concluded, No. 1, it is good science; No. 2, it should be done; and No. 3, it is in the national interest to build this machine.

Beginning in 1986, there was an attempt to look around the country and see where the best site to build the project might be. There was a competition in which approximately 36 States competed. Seven finalist States were chosen, but the State of New York dropped out.

In 1988, the State of Texas was chosen to be the site for the SSC. Since that time over 2,000 world class scientists have moved to Texas, over 500 construction workers, are building the project, and around the country over 15,000 subcontractors and contractors are involved in some capacity.

I want everybody in this Chamber to hear the next statement. The latest audit that was done in August on the cost of the project showed that it is 19 percent complete and 6 to 8 percent under the budget—under the budget—19 percent complete, 6 to 8 percent under the budget.

When our worthy opponents talk about cost escalation, they are talking about the possible cost to complete the project. It is true that the cost to complete has gone up because of a conscious decision to stretch the project out.

The Clinton administration is asking for \$640 million this year and \$640 million each of the next 3 years. Under the Bush administration preliminary budget the SSC request would have been about \$780 million this year and up to \$1 billion each for the next 2 years.

If you take longer to build something, it is going to cost more.

Again, of money spent to date, the project is 19 percent complete, and 6 to 8 percent under budget.

The amazing thing is that the SSC has actually made progress this year. At various points in time there have been as many as six different investigatory committees and subpanels down in Texas and around the country investigating the project, and they still made progress. There are 14 miles of tunnels, the main surface buildings, and some of the best laboratories in the world complete and ready for operation.

If we vote to kill the super collider, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] has pointed out, we are not going to save any money. The money is going to be reallocated to various other projects in the bill.

Another important point to ponder is that the scientists that are building the SSC guarantee success. It is not like the space program back in the sixties where we hoped to make it to the Moon. SSC leaders guarantee that in the energy range of the super collider, 20 trillion electron volts, they are going to find some answers to some basic questions that mankind has been trying to answer for thousands of years. They guarantee that they will do that.

So what it really boils down to, Mr. Speaker, is a vote of confidence in the United States of America. If we vote today to kill the super collider and the conference report accepts that recommendation, we say that we do not have confidence in the future. We do not have confidence in our scientists. We do not have confidence in world cooperation in the scientific realm.

The budget amount for the SSC is less than six-tenths of 1 percent of the basic science budget of this Nation. It is less than 3 hours of Federal spending. That is what we are talking about.

Remember, the Senate has voted 57 to 42 for the project, and the other body has voted every year for the project. President Clinton, as did President Bush, strongly supports the SSC.

The SSC is the American dream machine for the next generation to develop the technology that will develop the jobs that will make our lives and the lives of our children and grandchildren better and better.

So with great respect, Mr. Speaker, I would ask when it comes time for the parliamentary maneuvering that you vote yes on the previous question and yes on the final vote for the Energy and Water conference report.

□ 1320

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to make a few more points.

Cost per job for this project, is approximately \$74,000 per job. A previous speaker said that the cost per American citizen was 3 cents. Wrong. According to my calculations, Mr. Speaker, next year the Senate wants to spend \$640 million. Last time I checked, the population of this country was about 250 million. So, simple arithmetic tells me that the cost for just next year alone will be about \$2.60 per citizen.

It is that kind of math that has gotten us in the mess we are in today.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON].

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have tried very hard to understand the arguments against this report and against the super collider. I have listened very closely, and I simply do not understand it. I guess, because I am a nurse, I understand pain and suffering and the cost of health care, and I know the value of research, and I know the type of research the super collider can provide. I guess, because I am a business person, I know the value of having business products to sell, and I understand that researchers brought us many products over the years to sell. I understand, because I am from a working family, the value of having jobs, and I know it is this kind of research that is going to bring us jobs for the future and jobs for now.

We are beyond the cold war. We need conversion technologies. This is a kind of research that will bring it. This is a project that will look out for the future just as research in the past has looked out for where we are now. We would not have the mammograms, we would not have the scan machines, we would not have the vaccines, we would not have the VCR's.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking all my colleagues to support the report and support the super collider project.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUGHES). The gentleman from New York is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to make some key points as we wind down this debate.

One, we heard from the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, upon which I serve, and he talked about this project. I would remind that distinguished chairman that last year in the well of this House he spoke eloquently for an amendment that I supported that said we would not proceed with this project if we did not have a commitment signed by the President of the United States that there were a minimum of \$650 million in foreign con-

tributions by June 1 of 1993. We have less than one-tenth of that.

Second, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make this point. This project started out costing \$4.4 billion; and I say to the taxpayers, "Get this one. You ain't seen nothing yet. It started out at \$4.4 billion. It's not even 20 percent complete, and it's not costing \$5.3 billion. No, we've upped the ante. It's not \$5.9 billion; no, we've upped the ante. It's not \$8.25 billion; no, we've upped the ante. It's up over \$11 billion, and it's less than 20 percent complete. For those of you who are concerned about the future health of America let me point out that, while we are going ahead with this turkey, worked at nine, two out of three applications for assistance worthy applications to the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation from investigators, from scientists who have great promise are going unfunded. We can't give them the bucks because we are spending it all on this."

Mr. Speaker, we said we are going to have foreign contributions. We have not got the first yen yet, not the first deutsche mark, not the first peso. We are not getting foreign contributions. We are asked to fund this all ourselves, despite the fact that the House, by an overwhelming bipartisan vote, placed a 20-percent floor on foreign contributions.

Now what organizations outside this body have said they are with us? The National Taxpayers Union says, "Kill the SSC." The Citizens Against Government Waste says, "Kill the SSC." Friends of the Earth, one of the most respected environmental organizations, says, "Kill the SSC."

Why? Is it not good science? No, it is good science. It simply is not affordable science. We cannot afford to continue business as usual. We cannot afford a system where this House says by an overwhelming vote of 280 to 150 that we are going to reject something, and then within a matter of days we come back and say, "Nah, we didn't really mean it. We are going to proceed with that. We don't care. Throw caution to the wind. After all, it's only the taxpayers' dollars."

Taxpayers of America, I ask, "Do you think you're getting a good buy with this?"

The answer is clearly no, and do my colleagues know what the General Accounting Office said? The General Accounting Office says the SSC is behind schedule and over budget.

I say, "Defeat this, vote against the superconducting super collider for all the right reasons."

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. COPPERSMITH].

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, I wish we could balance the budget by cutting only bad programs, but there is an institutional issue here. The process

is giving us bad results. We have had a conference, but the conference increased spending. Whenever the House and the other body disagreed, in almost every case the conferees picked the higher number, and they saved other programs this House decided were not worthy of funding, like the advanced liquid metal reactor.

The super collider is a good program; I do not dispute its merits. But there is no easy way to cut this budget. We have to decide to cut among good programs. Believe me, if this was easy, we would have done it long ago.

I urge support from my colleagues who are trying to back up what the House did. I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question on this conference report.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SHARP].

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote no on the previous question so that we can again reinforce what the House overwhelmingly voted to do, which is to cut this budget, and my concern, as that of my colleague from Arizona, goes beyond just the SSC. The fact is the House overwhelmingly voted to eliminate the advanced liquid metal reactor for many very positive reasons, which documents since that time now reinforce the correctness of the House position. But what has happened in the conference committee is the House activities have been overturned, the effort to cut the budget has been frustrated. Indeed the total bill now costs the taxpayers more than it did when it passed by either the House or the Senate because of the games that get played in the other body to win votes to keep alive what we cannot afford in this country.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious budget-cutting issue as to whether we will stand firm and whether we will make majority rule in this country.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOAGLAND].

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I am here also to urge that you vote "no" on the previous question.

As we all know too well, Americans around the country, and Nebraskans, have expressed great concern about the budget agreement we enacted last August, that necessary vote we cast in order to put us in the direction of a balanced budget. We made tough decisions in preparing that budget. Each of us would have done it differently if we could have, but it is something we had to do. And we did it with the promise that we would require additional cuts. Now is one additional opportunity.

To put this in perspective, we Nebraskans must recognize that our tax share of the super collider is a mini-

mum of \$62.7 million over the construction phase of the project under current estimates. Those estimates will no doubt grow, as they have in the past. Do we Nebraskans feel that the super collider is essential enough to the future of our country now to tax ourselves over \$62 million? It may be desirable, but is it essential in a time when we are borrowing nearly a billion dollars a day to finance the Federal Government's activities?

I think not, Mr. Speaker. We should all vote "no."

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, those of us who are opposing the super collider are not doing so because we are against scientific research. Let me point out that the chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology in 1992 also said:

To fund this project would require massive reductions in other critical science programs, including other high energy physics programs.

Keep that in mind, my colleagues. I hope every Member will come by the table here and look at how much this is going to cost the individual States, and I would like to have the attention of the majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], who is certainly going to follow me here in just a second to wrap up for the proponents. He may focus on as how he can justify asking the taxpayers of Missouri to spend \$202 million for this project.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple question: Are we going to stand for our convictions and stand the ground that we took earlier this year when 280 Members of this body said "no" to future funding of the super collider?

□ 1330

I hope we do. Let us vote against the previous question on the motion to recommit and for the substitute motion to recommit.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from New York say there will be reductions in vital research. Not true; \$10.9 billion goes to NIH. That is a 5.9-percent increase, for 6,000 research grants. VA-HUD gets \$3 billion for the National Science Foundation, a 10-percent increase. We are not suffering reductions.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUGHES). The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 45 seconds.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, we shortly will be voting on the pre-

vious question. If that previous question is defeated, it will not be a simple matter. An amendment will be offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] that we knock out the \$640 million added by the Senate. It then goes back to conference. That means all of the items will be reopened. Many things will be considered that many Members will not want to consider.

The Senate is difficult to deal with on this subject. We tried to deal with them the other day. I can tell Members it is not quite that simple.

So I am going to offer a straight motion to recommit, the most honest motion that can be made. There will be no sweetheart deal, no fancy language. It will be a simple motion to recommit and go back and work with the Senate once again.

But with instructions, you open up everything, such items as waste clean-up, so many things will be opened up. I do not know how we will come back.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a vote for the previous question, leaving the decision on the motion to recommit to the decision of Members.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the majority leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The distinguished majority leader is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge that Members vote for the previous question and vote for the conference report. I know that in the minds of many Members, the superconducting super collider is the issue, and it is a very important issue. I think the position that the Members who have advocated the cutting out of the super collider is a legitimate position, and I think they are heartfelt in their concerns. And all of us are concerned about a budget that is spending too much money and a deficit that is too high, and all of us are looking for ways to cut the deficit.

But I urge Members today to stick with this conference report, because I believe strongly that this project is a sound project, for the deficit, for the budget, and for creating jobs in this country that we desperately need to create.

After the vote here a few weeks ago, I went to the site of the super collider. I had never been there. I have always been in favor of it, I have advocated it. But after the House voted in the way it did, I thought I had better go see it and talk to the people there about it.

Mr. Speaker, I come away from that visit even more convinced than I was before that we should continue this needed project. All over the country people are asking the same question. The question is, where are the jobs? We all talk about training, but training for what? We are in a tough world competition, with China, with Japan, Mexico, Europe, countries all over the

world. The truth is that today, in normal manufacturing processes, countries with much lower standards of living can produce products just as well as we can, and in some cases even better. The only way we will compete is if we are ahead in technology, ahead in the latest ideas that can be applied to products that we can manufacture, at least for a period of time, here in the United States.

The people in the scientific community and the people in our industrial community tell me that the kind of basic research that will go on in this project is precisely the kind of initial inquiry that we need that will translate into the telephones, into the computers, and all of the latest products that we are now making, 20 and 30 years from now.

I said when I argued before that Bob Galvin at Motorola supports this project, and said, "The new information from this basic research has energized the sustained growth that has caused companies like ours to grow 1,000 times in 50 years, to double in size every 5 years."

Mr. Speaker, it is an expensive project, but the expense is justified in terms of the ideas and the technology that will translate into the kinds of jobs that we have got to have in this society in the days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote for the future of our economy.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I must admonish our conferees on this bill regarding the subject of volunteer hosts for the possible siting of an MRS. This is the acronym for "monitored retrievable storage," the plan within the civilian nuclear waste program to find a suitable area for the short-term holding of spent nuclear fuel rods prior to final disposal.

Since 1987, when Congress created the "nuclear waste negotiator" position, it has been this person's job to search for volunteer candidates to host such a site. Today the other body had a hearing on this administration's nominee for the negotiator's job, a man most of us know, former Member Dick Stallings of Idaho. However, language in this conference report will tie the negotiator's hands in proceeding with allocation of so-called 2(b) grants to tribes or local units of government that wish to further pursue hosting an MRS.

This body has committee report language to clarify that before receiving DOE money for further studies a tribe must gain consensus from elected officials of the State within which their reservation lies. The other body added legislative language which would have done likewise. Both of these solutions seemed heavy-handed from an Indian sovereignty standpoint, so the conferees simply decided to stop the DOE from handing out any more 2(b) grants at all.

Mr. Speaker, finding a volunteer host for both an MRS and a second deep geologic disposal site for spent fuel is an important part of our Nation's nuclear waste policy. By the action of this conference committee that policy has been derailed. I do not ask the conferees to go back in and fix this. It won't happen and I know it.

My point is to inform Members with nuclear power reactors in their districts that sooner or later they're going to hear from their constituents about spent fuel stacking up at the reactors back home. Remember then that the 103d Congress decided that working with volunteer hosts for interim storage of nuclear waste just wasn't important.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to further funding for the superconducting super collider (SSC).

If completed, the superconducting super collider would be the largest and highest energy particle accelerator in the world. This unique research tool could unlock some of nature's greatest mysteries and lead to a better understanding of our universe. The project would also attract some of the brightest physicists and scientists to the United States, lead to the development of critical technologies, and secure America's leadership position in fundamental physics research. For these reasons, I have consistently supported funding for the SSC since the Department of Energy [DOE] first initiated the project and made it a top priority of the Department.

However, over the past several years I have been troubled by reports of cost overruns and mismanagement of the project. Originally, DOE projected that the SSC would cost \$5.9 billion. Then in 1990, the Energy Department conducted a comprehensive review of the project and estimated a cost of \$8.2 billion. Just this past spring, the General Accounting Office released a report titled, "SSC Is Over Budget and Behind Schedule." Now, with the Clinton administration's plan to "stretch out" the project over several more years, the SSC is expected to cost between \$11 and \$12 billion.

With the mounting Federal budget deficit, it has become increasingly more difficult over the past couple of years for fiscal conservatives such as myself to justify voting for such an expensive scientific endeavor. Although I generally feel it was a worthy investment, I realize Federal spending has to be prioritized, and annual, upward revisions of the project's cost has been steadily eroding my support for the SSC.

What finally convinced me to vote against funding the SSC was its lack of international support. Like the space station *Freedom*, the SSC was considered a "big science" project that was too big to be shouldered by the United States alone. Therefore, the Energy Department promised foreign contributions toward the development of the SSC totaling \$1.6 billion, but unlike the space station, the United States has only received a fraction of these foreign pledges.

During consideration of the fiscal year 1993 energy and water appropriations bill in 1992, I was prepared to vote against funding for the SSC. However, the adoption of an amendment offered by Science, Space, and Technology chairman, GEORGE BROWN and ranking Republican, BOB WALKER convinced me to give the Department of Energy another chance to secure international funding. The amendment made the release of Federal appropriations for the SSC contingent on the President's success in guaranteeing \$650 million in foreign contributions by April 1, 1993. This amendment assured that the cost of the SSC would

be shared by our international partners, so I voted in support of the SSC.

During debate over the SSC earlier this year, I was dismayed and angered to learn that the Energy Department had only received about \$50 million in foreign pledges, \$600 million short of what the Brown-Walker amendment required. Obviously, the international community had no interest in investing in the superconducting super collider either because they felt it was not a worthwhile venture or because they figured the United States would go ahead and build the SSC without any help. No matter what the reason, our foreign partners apparently hoped to benefit from the scientific discoveries produced by the SSC without paying for its development.

Voting against the superconducting super collider was a very difficult decision. Much of the SSC's research and development is being conducted in colleges and universities in Pennsylvania, including the Pennsylvania State University in my district. Nevertheless, I feel strongly that this is a prudent and responsible vote. Until the Energy Department gets serious about securing financial commitments from our so-called international partners, I do not think that Congress should appropriate any further money for the SSC. If other nations will benefit from discoveries and technology produced by the SSC, why shouldn't they contribute to its construction? The superconducting super collider is simply too expensive for the United States to build on our own.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report on the energy and water development appropriations bill, and in support of the superconducting super collider.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has always led the world in scientific research and technological achievement. The SSC will help physicists discover the fundamental nature of matter and energy, which will lead to major advancements in almost every field of technology. Some of the future applications of technology include: High speed magnetic levitation trains; magnetic energy storage systems for fuel conservation; magnetically propelled ships; and low-loss electric power transmission systems.

Without the SSC, U.S. industry would lose the opportunity to develop an infrastructure for superconductivity in this country, which represents a market estimated to reach \$8 to \$12 billion by the turn of the century.

Furthermore, a failure to follow through with the SSC will profoundly disturb the credibility of the DOE and the U.S. Government to both the world at large and to our own science community. A failure to build the SSC will disrupt the Nation's current high energy physics program. This is a balanced program and the SSC is an integral part of its focus.

Mr. Speaker, we need to cut the deficit. But we also need to secure our economic future. The investment in the superconducting super collider represents less than 1 percent of our total Federal research and development budget, yet it is an investment in an area of science that has a proven record of economic return.

I urge my colleagues to support the superconducting super collider and to support the energy and water development appropriations conference report.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 2445, the energy and water development appropriations bill for fiscal 1994.

I want to commend Chairman TOM BEVILL and ranking member, JOHN MYERS, as well as the rest of the subcommittee, for the outstanding job they did in fashioning a bill which addresses our country's most basic energy and water development needs, while still coming in some \$25 million below last year's funding level.

I regret that the bill contains \$640 million to continue construction of the superconducting super collider, and another \$37 million for the advanced liquid metal reactor program, both of which the House had voted to terminate.

In these times of great budget deficits, we just cannot afford to spend money on big-ticket boondoggles such as the supercollider, which is now expected to cost in excess of \$11 billion. I regret that the Senate refused to follow the House's lead in terminating this project, and that we have lost an opportunity to take another huge chunk out of the budget deficit.

Accordingly, I am reluctantly compelled to vote to recommit the bill, with instructions to the House conferees to hold the House position on the superconducting super collider. I realize this will delay passage of this bill, but it is the only option we have to stop this project before we waste any more money on it.

Aside from my concerns about the super collider and the liquid metal reactor program, I believe this is an excellent bill. It provides important funding for energy research and development, environmental restoration and waste management, and a host of reclamation projects.

The bill also provides funding for the Army Corps of Engineers to carry out public works projects across the country which create jobs, strengthen our infrastructure and economic base, and generate hundreds of millions of dollars in local tax revenues.

I know the subcommittee had many more requests to fund water development projects than it could possibly accommodate without exceeding the budget. It was a difficult task for the subcommittee to pare down the list and only fund those projects which are most important.

In my own case, I had many more federally authorized projects in my own district in southern New Jersey for which I chose not to request funding, because I feel they are not critical and can reasonably be deferred until we get our fiscal house in order in Washington.

Instead, I once again only supported those projects in my district which are directly related to our coastal economy and environment, and which cannot be deferred. I am very pleased that the full Congress has agreed to support these projects.

They include: Maintenance dredging along the New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway, which is the major north-south water route through our State; the Cold Spring Inlet, which serves the U.S. Coast Guard Training Center and base in Cape May; and the Maurice River, which supports important shipbuilding activities in Cumberland County.

The bill also continues the shore protection and water quality studies which are now un-

derway for four important navigation and beach erosion control projects in southern New Jersey, all of which are a part of the New Jersey shore protection master plan and are consistent with the State's own priorities.

They are: Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet, Townsends Inlet to Cape May Inlet, the Delaware Bay coastline, and the Lower Cape May Meadows/Cape May Point.

These studies are aimed at developing cost-effective programs to maintain safe and navigable waterways, stabilize the shoreline, and protect shore communities from the dangers of storms and erosion.

Finally, the bill provides funding for the Army Corps of Engineers to deepen the Salem River, to help facilitate the development of the port in Salem, NJ.

I regret that this overall excellent bill is burdened by additional moneys for the superconducting super collider. It is my hope that the conferees will remove these moneys, so that we can move ahead with final passage of this important legislation.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to funding the superconducting super collider—the so-called SSC. Our Nation cannot afford it. This House has voted 2 years in a row to eliminate the funding for this program, but each year the SSC has come back to life.

Most recently, the house of Representatives voted on June 24, 1993, by a margin of 280–150, to terminate the project. Last year, the house voted on June 17, by a margin of 232–181, to end funding for the SSC.

Our country is a world leader in technology and we must continue to support our Nation's scientific research programs. The SSC, however, is a program that we simply cannot responsibly fund. If we did not currently have a deficit in excess of \$4 trillion, perhaps we could look at the merits of the project through different lenses. But what I see when I look at the SSC now is a program that has grown in cost from \$4.4 billion in 1987 to over \$11 billion today. Furthermore, when the program was initially funded in 1987, Congress was told that its costs would be partially underwritten through foreign contributions—partially meant \$1.7 billion. Yet, I understand that the Department of Energy now estimates that the foreign contribution will never total more than \$400 million.

The General Accounting Office [GAO] reports to us that the SSC is behind schedule and over budget. Although proponents have argued that the potential scientific benefits outweigh the high costs and that the SSC should be an immediate priority, I note that even the administration has proposed stretching out the project.

Let's not commit ourselves to fund projects our Nation clearly cannot afford. Let us choose our priorities carefully. Let us not let this project come back to life again this year.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 2445, the fiscal year 1994 Energy and Water appropriations bill. I would like to commend chairman BEVILL and ranking minority Member MYERS for their fine work in bringing this fiscally responsible bill to the House floor.

Although H.R. 2445 contains many worthy provisions, I would like to

bring to my colleagues' attention a project contained in the bill of particular importance to the people who reside in New Jersey's Middlesex, Somerset, and Union counties. The project to which I refer is called the Green Book flood control project.

As my colleagues may recall, this project was authorized by Congress under the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662, Section 401). During the past 8 fiscal years, Congress has appropriated over \$14 million for this project. In fiscal year 1986, Congress appropriated \$484,000; in fiscal year 1987, \$1.37 million; fiscal year 1988, \$1.4 million; fiscal year 1989, \$1.5 million; fiscal year 1990, \$1.2 million; fiscal year 1991, \$2 million; fiscal year 1992, \$3.169 million; and fiscal year 1993, \$3.5 million. For fiscal year 1994, Congress is providing \$2.8 million to continue the following tasks: preconstruction engineering and design—including hydraulic and hydrologic analysis; environmental investigations and data collection; topographic mapping; and layout of levee alignments.

Completion of this project is vital if we are to prevent the enormous damage that another flood could bring. My colleagues may recall the great flood of 1973 that occurred in what is now largely the Seventh Congressional District of New Jersey. This flood claimed the lives of six people and caused tens of millions of dollars in damage. I would venture that if a similar flood occurred today, the damage could exceed a billion dollars.

That flood, coupled with an earlier one that occurred in 1971, provided the impetus for the Green Book flood control project. Since this project is so encompassing, we must proceed now before another devastating flood arrives. It is a little over 20 years to the day since the last great flood in this area, and it is only a matter of time before such a flood occurs again. Completion of this project ensures that this area will be adequately prepared for such an event.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to thank my good friend and fellow New Jersey colleague, Congressman DEAN GALLO, for his assistance and guidance on this project. This project's success is due in large part to DEAN's tireless work as a member of the House Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee. The people of New Jersey's Seventh Congressional District certainly owe DEAN a debt of gratitude for all his efforts on their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "aye" on the conference report to H.R. 2445.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MYERS
OF INDIANA

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in its present form, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MYERS of Indiana moves to recommit the conference report on H.R. 2445 to the committee of conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 159, nays 264, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 510]

YEAS—159

Ackerman	Fields (TX)	Michel
Andrews (NJ)	Foglietta	Mineta
Andrews (TX)	Franks (CT)	Mollohan
Armedy	Franks (NJ)	Montgomery
Bacchus (FL)	Frost	Moorhead
Bachus (AL)	Furse	Murtha
Baker (LA)	Gallegly	Myers
Barlow	Gallo	Nadler
Bartlett	Gephardt	Natcher
Barton	Geren	Ortiz
Bateman	Gibbons	Owens
Bentley	Glichrest	Oxley
Bevill	Gingrich	Packard
Bishop	Gonzalez	Pastor
Blackwell	Goodlatte	Payne (VA)
Bliley	Gordon	Peterson (FL)
Blute	Grams	Pickett
Boehner	Green	Pickle
Bonilla	Hall (TX)	Quillen
Bonior	Hansen	Rahall
Borski	Hastings	Reynolds
Boucher	Hayes	Richardson
Brooks	Hilliard	Roberts
Browder	Hochbrueckner	Roemer
Brown (CA)	Horn	Rogers
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Rose
Buyer	Jefferson	Santorum
Callahan	Johnson (CT)	Sarpalius
Chapman	Johnson, E. B.	Scott
Clay	Johnson, Sam	Skeen
Clyburn	Klink	Skelton
Coleman	Kolbe	Smith (IA)
Combest	Kopetski	Smith (TX)
Cooper	LaRocco	Spence
Cox	Laughlin	Stenholm
Coyne	Lewis (CA)	Stokes
Cramer	Lightfoot	Stump
Crapo	Livingston	Swift
Darden	Lloyd	Taylor (NC)
de la Garza	Lowe	Tejeda
DeLay	Manton	Thomas (CA)
Derrick	Matsui	Thompson
Diaz-Balart	Mazzoli	Thornnton
Dicks	McCandless	Torres
Dixon	McCloskey	Torricelli
Dooley	McCollum	Trafficant
Dornan	McCrery	Volkmer
Dreier	McDade	Vucanovich
Dunn	McDermott	Whitten
Edwards (TX)	McHale	Wilson
Everett	McNulty	Wise
Fazio	Meek	Yates
Fields (LA)	Mica	Young (AK)

NAYS—264

Abercrombie	Hinchey	Pombo
Allard	Hoagland	Pomeroy
Andrews (ME)	Hobson	Porter
Applegate	Hoekstra	Portman
Archer	Hoke	Poshard
Baessler	Holden	Price (NC)
Baker (CA)	Houghton	Pryce (OH)
Ballenger	Huffington	Quinn
Barca	Hughes	Ramstad
Barcia	Hunter	Rangel
Barrett (NE)	Hutchinson	Ravenel
Barrett (WI)	Hutto	Reed
Becerra	Hyde	Regula
Beilenson	Inglis	Ridge
Bereuter	Inhofe	Rohrabacher
Berman	Inslee	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilbray	Istook	Rostenkowski
Billrakis	Jacobson	Roth
Boehlert	Johnson (GA)	Roukema
Brewster	Johnson (SD)	Rowland
Brown (OH)	Johnston	Roybal-Allard
Bunning	Kanjorski	Royce
Byrne	Kaptur	Rush
Calvert	Kasich	Sabo
Camp	Kennedy	Sanders
Canady	Kennelly	Sangmeister
Cantwell	Kildee	Sawyer
Cardin	Kim	Saxton
Carr	King	Schaefer
Castle	Kingston	Schenk
Clayton	Kleczka	Schroeder
Clement	Klein	Schumer
Clinger	Klug	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Knollenberg	Serrano
Collins (GA)	Kreidler	Sharp
Collins (IL)	Kyl	Shaw
Collins (MI)	LaFalce	Shays
Condit	Lambert	Shepherd
Coppersmith	Lancaster	Shuster
Costello	Lantos	Siskis
Crane	Lazio	Skaggs
Cunningham	Leach	Slattery
Danner	Lehman	Slaughter
DeFazio	Levin	Smith (NJ)
DeLauro	Levy	Smith (OR)
Dellums	Lewis (FL)	Snowe
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)	Solomon
Dickey	Linder	Spratt
Long	Lipinski	Stark
Dingell	Long	Stearns
Doolittle	Machtley	Strickland
Duncan	Maloney	Studds
Durbin	Mann	Stupak
Emerson	Manzullo	Sundquist
English (AZ)	Margolies	Swett
English (OK)	Mezvisinsky	Synar
Eshoo	Markay	Talent
Evans	Martinez	Tanner
Farr	McHugh	Tauzin
Fawell	McInnis	Taylor (MS)
Filner	McKeon	Thomas (WY)
Fingerhut	McKinney	Thurman
Fish	McMillan	Torkildsen
Flake	Meehan	Towns
Ford (MI)	Menendez	Tucker
Fowler	Meyers	Unsoeld
Frank (MA)	Mfume	Upton
Gejdenson	Miller (CA)	Valentine
Gekas	Miller (FL)	Velazquez
Gillmor	Minge	Vento
Gilman	Mink	Visclosky
Glickman	Mollinari	Walker
Goodling	Moran	Walsh
Goss	Morella	Washington
Grandy	Neal (MA)	Waters
Greenwood	Neal (NC)	Watt
Gunderson	Nussle	Waxman
Gutierrez	Oberstar	Weldon
Hall (OH)	Obey	Wheat
Hamburg	Oliver	Williams
Hamilton	Orton	Wolf
Hancock	Pallone	Woolsey
Harman	Parker	Wyden
Hastert	Paxon	Wynn
Hefley	Payne (NJ)	Young (FL)
Hefner	Pelosi	Zeliff
Hefner	Penny	Zimmer
Hefner	Peterson (MN)	
Herger	Petri	

NOT VOTING—10

Bryant	Ford (TN)	Schiff
Burton	McCurdy	Smith (MI)
Edwards (CA)	Moakley	
Engel	Murphy	

□ 1357

Mr. MCKEON, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LA-FALCE, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Messrs. CUNNINGHAM, ARCHER, and GEKAS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. FOGLIETTA, SKELTON, CLYBURN, and RAHALL changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question on the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1400

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SLATTERY TO THE
MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MYERS
OF INDIANA

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SLATTERY to the motion to recommit offered by Mr. MYERS of Indiana: Insert before the period at the end the following: "with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33".

Mr. SLATTERY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUGHES). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, but I would ask my colleague from Kansas to explain the motion to recommit, because there is some question as to whether or not this motion would affect projects other than the SSC.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHLERT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend my colleagues for the last vote. This is a very important vote for this institution and the taxpayers. Now we must add an instruction to the motion to recommit to the conferees directing them to maintain the House position on the question of the super collider. So for those who want to kill the super collider, the next vote is a "yes" vote. Let me say it again, for those who want to kill the super collider, the next vote is a "yes" vote.

It is a motion to instruct the conferees to stick to the House position.

Let me also point out that this motion that we are about to vote on does not affect any other issue in this conference report. And I think that point needs to be made clear.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there has been a misstatement made, a statement that is not true, that it does not open up the conference for everything. If we go back to conference with the Senate, everything is open again. It has been represented that this does not have an effect on anything else, but if you look and if you read the order, if we go back to work with the Senate, everything is open again.

Mr. SLATTERY. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, the vote against the super collider is now a "yes" vote on the instruction to conferees. We want to vote "yes" at this time.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] to the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] and on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment to the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY].

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 282, nays 143, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 511]

YEAS—282

Abercrombie	Byrne	DeLauro
Allard	Calvert	Dellums
Andrews (ME)	Camp	Deutch
Applegate	Canady	Dickey
Archer	Cantwell	Dingell
Baessler	Cardin	Dooley
Baker (CA)	Carr	Doolittle
Ballenger	Castle	Duncan
Barca	Clayton	Durbin
Barcia	Clement	Edwards (CA)
Barrett (NE)	Clinger	English (AZ)
Barrett (WI)	Clyburn	English (OK)
Becerra	Coble	Eshoo
Beilenson	Collins (GA)	Evans
Bereuter	Collins (IL)	Ewing
Berman	Collins (MI)	Farr
Bilbray	Condit	Fawell
Bilirakis	Conyers	Filner
Blackwell	Cooper	Fingerhut
Bliley	Coppersmith	Fish
Boehlert	Costello	Flake
Brewster	Crane	Foglietta
Brown (OH)	Danner	Ford (MI)
Bunning	Deal	Fowler
Burton	DeFazio	Frank (MA)

Gejdenson	Lewis (GA)	Sabo
Gekas	Linder	Sanders
Gillmor	Lipinski	Sangmeister
Gilman	Long	Sawyer
Glickman	Machtley	Saxton
Goodling	Maloney	Schaefer
Gordon	Mann	Schroeder
Goss	Manzullo	Schumer
Grandy	Margolies-	Sensenbrenner
Greenwood	Mezvinsky	Serrano
Gunderson	Markey	Sharp
Gutierrez	Martinez	Shaw
Hall (OH)	Mazzoli	Shays
Hamburg	McHugh	Shepherd
Hamilton	McInnis	Shuster
Hancock	McKeon	Sisisky
Harman	McKinney	Skaggs
Hastert	McMillan	Slattery
Hefley	Meehan	Slaughter
Hefner	Menendez	Smith (NJ)
Herger	Meyers	Smith (OR)
Hinchey	Mfume	Snow
Hoagland	Miller (CA)	Solomon
Hobson	Miller (FL)	Spence
Hoekstra	Minge	Spratt
Hoke	Mink	Stark
Holden	Molinari	Stearns
Houghton	Moran	Strickland
Huffington	Morella	Studds
Hughes	Neal (MA)	Stupak
Hunter	Neal (NC)	Sundquist
Hutchinson	Nussle	Swift
Hutto	Oberstar	Synar
Hyde	Obey	Talent
Inglis	Oliver	Tanner
Inhofe	Orton	Tauzin
Inslee	Owens	Taylor (MS)
Istook	Pallone	Thomas (WY)
Jacobs	Parker	Thornton
Johnson (CT)	Paxon	Thurman
Johnson (GA)	Payne (NJ)	Torkildsen
Johnson (SD)	Pelosi	Towns
Johnston	Penny	Tucker
Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)	Unsoeld
Kaptur	Petri	Upton
Kasich	Pombo	Valentine
Kennedy	Pomeroy	Velasquez
Kennelly	Porter	Vento
Kildee	Portman	Visclosky
Kim	Poshard	Walker
King	Price (NC)	Walsh
Kingston	Pryce (OH)	Washington
Kleczka	Quillen	Waters
Klein	Quinn	Watt
Klink	Rahall	Waxman
Klug	Ramstad	Weldon
Knollenberg	Rangel	Wheat
Kolbe	Ravenel	Williams
Kreidler	Reed	Wise
Kyl	Regula	Wolf
LaFalce	Ridge	Woolsey
Lambert	Rohrabacher	Wyden
Lancaster	Ros-Lehtinen	Wynn
Lantos	Rostenkowski	Yates
Lazio	Roth	Young (FL)
Leach	Roukema	Zeliff
Lehman	Rowland	Zimmer
Levin	Roybal-Allard	
Levy	Royce	
Lewis (FL)	Rush	

NAYS—143

Ackerman	Brown (FL)	Emerson
Andrews (NJ)	Buyer	Everett
Andrews (TX)	Callahan	Fazio
Armey	Chapman	Fields (LA)
Bacchus (FL)	Clay	Fields (TX)
Bacchus (AL)	Coleman	Franks (CT)
Baker (LA)	Combest	Franks (NJ)
Barlow	Cox	Frost
Bartlett	Coyne	Furse
Barton	Cramer	Gallely
Bateman	Crapo	Gallo
Bentley	Cunningham	Gephardt
Bevill	Darden	Geren
Bishop	de la Garza	Gibbons
Blute	DeLay	Gilchrest
Boehner	Derrick	Gingrich
Bonilla	Diaz-Balart	Gonzalez
Bonior	Dicks	Goodlatte
Borski	Dixon	Grams
Boucher	Dornan	Green
Brooks	Dreier	Hall (TX)
Browder	Dunn	Hansen
Brown (CA)	Edwards (TX)	Hastings

Hayes	McNulty	Rose
Hilliard	Meek	Santorum
Hochbrueckner	Mica	Sarpaluis
Horn	Michel	Schenk
Hoyer	Mineta	Scott
Jefferson	Mollohan	Skeen
Johnson, E. B.	Montgomery	Skelton
Johnson, Sam	Moorhead	Smith (IA)
Kopetski	Murtha	Smith (TX)
LaRocco	Myers	Stenholm
Laughlin	Nadler	Stokes
Lewis (CA)	Natcher	Stump
Lightfoot	Ortiz	Taylor (NC)
Livingston	Oxley	Tejeda
Lloyd	Packard	Thomas (CA)
Lowe	Pastor	Thompson
Manton	Payne (VA)	Torres
Matsui	Peterson (FL)	Torricelli
McCandless	Pickett	Trafiacant
McCloskey	Pickle	Volkmer
McCollum	Reynolds	Vucanovich
McCrery	Richardson	Whitten
McDade	Roberts	Wilson
McDermott	Roemer	Young (AK)
McHale	Rogers	

NOT VOTING—8

Bryant	McCurdy	Schiff
Engel	Moakley	Smith (MI)
Ford (TN)	Murphy	

□ 1421

Miss COLLINS of Michigan changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment to the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit, as amended.

The motion to recommit, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2491, DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the de novo vote on House Resolution 275.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 273, nays 151, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 512]

AYES—273

Abercrombie	Barlow	Blackwell
Ackerman	Barrett (WI)	Boehlert
Andrews (ME)	Barton	Bonior
Andrews (NJ)	Becerra	Borski
Andrews (TX)	Beilenson	Boucher
Applegate	Bereuter	Brewster
Bacchus (FL)	Berman	Brooks
Baessler	Bevill	Browder
Barca	Bilbray	Brown (CA)
Barcia	Bishop	Brown (FL)

Brown (OH)
Bryant
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
De la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gallo
Gelderson
Gephardt
Geron
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Grandy
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinche
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Hoke
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer

Hughes
Hutto
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Klecza
Klein
Klink
Klug
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-
Mezvinaky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett

Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshord
Price (NC)
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Santorum
Sarbanes
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Shepherd
Sisk
Skaggs
Skeel
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tausin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkm
Washington
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NOES—151

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bentley
Billirakis

Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Crapo
Cunningham

Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Conyers
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham

Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallely
Gekas
Gillchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goss
Grams
Greenwood
Hancock
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ingalls
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson, Sam

Kasich
King
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Machtle
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCreary
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Mollinari
Moorhead
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Penny
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn

NOT VOTING—9

Bateman
Engel
Ford (TN)

McCloskey
McCurdy
Moakley

Murphy
Smith (MI)
Waters

□ 1440

Mr. KOPETSKI changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2491) making appropriations for the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUGHES). Pursuant to House Resolution 275, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Monday, October 4, 1993, at page 23343.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] in favor of the conference report?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, if I may be recognized, let me say that in its present form I am in support of the conference report.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the conference report. Pursuant to the rule, I request that one-third of the time be allocated to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rules of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] will be recognized for 20 minutes, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on H.R. 2491, as well as on the Senate amendments reported in disagreement, and that I may include tables, charts, and other extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to take a moment to recognize the members of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies, who have done an outstanding job in terms of bringing this conference report and, prior to that, the bill, to the House floor. It has been a real pleasure for me to work with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN], the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES], and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON].

Mr. Speaker, on the minority side, it has been a real honor to work with the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the ranking minority member. We have had an excellent working relationship throughout this entire period. It has also been an honor to work with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLO]. Each of them has been hard-working subcommittee members, and it has been a real pleasure to work with them in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to take a moment to pay tribute to a hard-working and very talented and skilled staff, particularly Dick Malow, the staff director, along with Paul Thomson, Michelle Burkett, Dan Cantu, and Ms. Shirley Day, who is on detail from the National Science Foundation.

These people often work many long hours at night and work weekends to help prepare and bring these bills to

the floor, and I want to acknowledge the great service they render for the House.

Mr. Speaker, we bring back to the House today the conference report on the fiscal year 1994 VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations bill. As always, this is a very difficult bill to reach agreement with the Senate—because it is a bill that demands some very difficult choices.

But, Mr. Speaker, I believe we have brought back a fair conference agreement—a balanced conference agreement—and, above all, an agreement that parts from the usual way of doing business.

I want to take just a minute to expand a little bit on what I mean by that last comment.

When I came before the House this past June, I explained that Senator MIKULSKI and I had hammered out an agreement which tried to address the concern that the appropriations committees had increasingly included numerous unauthorized projects and legislation in our annual bills.

This agreement was not easy to implement. We had to say no to many of our colleagues. But the Senator and I felt it was the right thing to do.

In capsule form, what we agreed to do was this.

The 1994 VA-HUD bill would include no legislation—including language requested by the President.

The only exceptions we made to that policy were the following:

Limitations in order under the House rules,

Technical legislation that had been carried previously in the bill—or needed some adjustment,

And, of course, any major program activities lacking general funding authorization, such as EPA, NASA, and NSF.

Also, the agreement provided that we would include no unauthorized site-specific projects in either the bill or the report.

We also agreed that we would not include any HUD special projects.

It has been very tough to maintain that agreement. But, Senator MIKULSKI and I made an agreement and both of us kept our word.

It is our belief that the bill before you includes no legislation that does not meet the test we set for ourselves—and I believe we have not included any site-specific projects for Members that are not authorized.

The bottom line is that we have made a good faith effort to meet the commitment that we discussed this

past June. And I would hope that our friends from the legislative committees recognize that we have kept our commitment.

Now let me point out why it was so tough to put this conference agreement together. The fact is that we were working under a number of constraints this year that we would not normally have to deal with.

To begin with, because we proposed no legislation in this bill—we were not able to use any outlay-enhancing gimmicks.

Second, after the bill left the House, the White House informed the committees that an additional \$100 million was required in the NASA account as a payment to Russia. Having to shoehorn in an additional \$100 million at that point was almost impossible.

So we had to make some tough choices.

We have effectively killed the AXAF-S Program—although we are providing sufficient money to look at the possibility of flying the key instrument on a Japanese satellite.

We have reduced the President's \$20,000,000 new technology initiative science data purchase to zero. We effectively killed the President's new small satellite technology program.

And, we have killed the so-called search for extraterrestrial intelligence program.

Also in NASA, we could not fully fund either the comet or spacehab programs—and we are terminating the advanced solid rocket motor program.

At the appropriate time I will offer a motion implementing the termination and transferring any ASRM funds above what the House agreed to into NSF programs, NASA's national aerospace plane, and EPA's Superfund.

I also think it's important to point out that this agreement does not include \$204 million for the so-called locality pay.

Under the recently passed Treasury Appropriations Act, these moneys must be paid in 1994—the bottom line is that all agencies in the bill, including VA hospitals, will have to eat this substantial amount of money. Combined with the cuts carried in the conference agreement for a number of salaries and expense accounts, this could cause furloughs or RIF's later in fiscal year 1994.

Mr. Speaker, this bill received a section 602(b) allocation that was \$900 million in outlays and \$1.3 billion in budget authority below the President's request. When we consider the constraints I just talked about and the wishes and wants of all the Members on

both sides of this building—I believe we bring back to the House today a reasonable and balanced bill.

I want to highlight a few of the items in this bill.

We are providing \$15,622,000,000 for veterans' medical care. That is nearly a \$1 billion increase above 1993.

We are providing \$252 million for VA medical and prosthetic research—a \$20 million increase above last year.

Under Housing, we are providing \$9,313,000,000 for assisted housing. That is roughly a \$500 million increase above 1993.

We are also providing \$778 million for the new HOPE VI program to address some of the most difficult problems in public housing.

We are providing \$4,400,000,000 for the community development block grant program—an increase of \$160 million above 1993.

And under the homeless programs we are providing \$723 million—an increase of almost \$150 million above 1993.

For the programs of the Environmental Protection Agency, we are providing \$6,659,000,000—an increase of almost \$300 million above the budget request.

For NASA, we are appropriating \$14,551,500,000—a reduction of more than \$710 million below the budget request—but an increase of almost \$250 million above 1993.

And, for the National Science Foundation, we are appropriating more than \$3 billion—which is an increase of \$294 million above 1993.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we have brought back the Selective Service issue for another vote in the House and Senate.

We could not reach agreement on Selective Service. I believe that the time has come to save this money—and as we used to do with an old car—put the Selective Service System up on blocks.

We can come back and get that system up and running in plenty of time. But given the current world conditions today—the American All-Volunteer Army is working fine—and I believe this is \$20 million which we can save and use on other higher priority programs or on deficit reduction.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill and I hope that the Members will support this conference agreement, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would include a table on the conference agreement and the resolution of the amendments in disagreement.

H.R. 2491 - Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies, 1994

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I						
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS						
Veterans Benefits Administration						
Compensation and pensions.....	16,969,239,000	16,828,446,000	16,828,446,000	16,828,446,000	16,828,446,000	-140,793,000
Readjustment benefits.....	814,010,000	847,400,000	847,400,000	847,400,000	847,400,000	+133,390,000
Veterans insurance and indemnities.....	22,730,000	15,370,000	15,370,000	15,370,000	15,370,000	-7,360,000
Guaranty and indemnity program account (indefinite).....	485,766,000	482,119,000	482,119,000	482,119,000	482,119,000	-33,647,000
Administrative expenses.....	40,524,000	56,231,000	56,231,000	56,231,000	56,231,000	+15,707,000
Loan guaranty program account (indefinite).....	49,275,000	27,647,000	27,647,000	27,647,000	27,647,000	-21,628,000
Administrative expenses.....	87,869,000	70,716,000	70,716,000	70,716,000	70,716,000	-17,153,000
Direct loan program account (indefinite).....	97,000	69,000	69,000	69,000	69,000	-28,000
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	
Administrative expenses.....	1,393,000	2,863,000	2,863,000	2,863,000	2,863,000	+1,470,000
(Loan level).....	(147,000)	(798,000)	(798,000)	(798,000)	(798,000)	(+651,000)
Education loan fund program account.....	1,000	1,032	1,032	1,032	1,032	+32
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(11,000)	(3,571)	(3,571)	(3,571)	(3,571)	(-7,429)
Administrative expenses.....	305,000	186,000	186,000	186,000	186,000	-119,000
Vocational rehabilitation loans program account.....	51,000	53,000	53,000	53,000	53,000	+2,000
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(1,780,000)	(2,387,000)	(2,387,000)	(2,387,000)	(2,387,000)	(+627,000)
Administrative expenses.....	962,000	751,000	751,000	751,000	751,000	-211,000
Native American Veteran Housing Loan Program.....	4,500,000					-4,500,000
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(58,400,000)					(-58,400,000)
Administrative expenses.....	500,000	156,000	156,000	156,000	156,000	-344,000
Total, Veterans Benefits Administration.....	18,487,222,000	18,412,008,032	18,412,008,032	18,412,008,032	18,412,008,032	-75,213,968
Veterans Health Administration						
Medical care.....	14,645,723,000	15,642,452,000	15,522,452,000	15,637,452,000	15,622,452,000	+976,729,000
Health care reform contingency fund (emergency).....				500,000,000		
Total.....	14,645,723,000	15,642,452,000	15,522,452,000	16,137,452,000	15,622,452,000	+976,729,000
Medical and prosthetic research.....	232,000,000	206,000,000	252,000,000	252,000,000	252,000,000	+20,000,000
Health professional scholarship program.....	10,113,000	10,386,000	10,386,000	10,386,000	10,386,000	+273,000
Health professionals education loan repayment program.....	5,000,000			10,000,000		-5,000,000
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	68,954,000	68,500,000	68,500,000	73,500,000	68,500,000	-454,000
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines.....	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	
Transitional housing loan program:						
Loan program account (by transfer).....	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	
Administrative expenses (by transfer).....	(50,000)	(52,000)	(52,000)	(52,000)	(52,000)	(+2,000)
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	
Total, Veterans Health Administration.....	14,962,290,000	15,927,838,000	15,853,838,000	16,483,838,000	15,953,838,000	+991,548,000
Departmental Administration						
General operating expenses.....	811,919,000	823,249,000	823,249,000	826,249,000	826,749,000	+14,830,000
National Cemetery System.....	70,888,000	70,507,000	70,507,000	70,507,000	70,507,000	-161,000
Office of Inspector General.....	31,182,000	31,520,000	31,436,000	31,436,000	31,436,000	+254,000
Construction, major projects.....	492,674,000	362,293,000	322,793,000	369,000,000	369,000,000	-123,674,000
(By transfer).....		(14,000,000)	(14,000,000)	(14,000,000)	(14,000,000)	(+14,000,000)
Construction, minor projects.....	149,525,000	153,540,000	153,540,000	153,540,000	153,540,000	+4,015,000
Parking revolving fund.....	1,317,000	1,353,000	1,353,000	1,353,000	1,353,000	+36,000
Grants for construction of state extended care facilities.....	40,000,000	41,080,000	41,080,000	41,080,000	41,080,000	+1,080,000
Grants for the construction of state veterans cemeteries.....	5,104,000	5,242,000	5,242,000	5,242,000	5,242,000	+138,000
Total, Departmental Administration.....	1,602,389,000	1,488,784,000	1,449,200,000	1,500,407,000	1,496,907,000	-103,482,000
Total, title I, Department of Veterans Affairs.....	35,051,901,000	35,828,630,032	35,715,046,032	36,396,253,032	35,864,753,032	+812,852,032
(By transfer).....	(57,000)	(14,059,000)	(14,059,000)	(14,059,000)	(14,059,000)	(+14,002,000)
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(61,388,000)	(4,258,571)	(4,258,571)	(4,258,571)	(4,258,571)	(-57,129,429)
Consisting of:						
Mandatory.....	(18,351,117,000)	(18,281,051,000)	(18,281,051,000)	(18,281,051,000)	(18,281,051,000)	(-70,066,000)
Discretionary.....	(16,700,784,000)	(17,547,579,032)	(17,433,995,032)	(18,115,202,032)	(17,583,702,032)	(+882,918,032)
TITLE II						
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
Housing Programs						
Homeownership and opportunity for people everywhere grants (HOPE grants).....	271,000,000	109,190,000	119,190,000	109,190,000	109,190,000	-161,810,000
Rescission of FY 1992 and FY 1993 HOPE funds.....			-250,000,000	-250,000,000	-250,000,000	-250,000,000
HOME investment partnerships program.....	1,172,500,000	1,800,000,000	1,325,000,000	1,275,000,000	1,275,000,000	+102,500,000

H.R. 2491 - Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies, 1994

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Annual contributions for assisted housing	8,836,731,000	8,423,000,000	9,192,900,000	9,334,900,000	9,312,900,000	+476,169,000
Public housing bond refinancing	-10,000,000					+10,000,000
Transfer from flexible subsidy and Nehemiah fund	42,934,000					-42,934,000
Rescission of assisted housing deobligations (budget authority, indefinite)	-8,000,000					+8,000,000
Total, annual contributions (net)	8,861,665,000	8,423,000,000	9,192,900,000	9,334,900,000	9,312,900,000	+451,235,000
Assistance for the renewal of expiring section 8 subsidy contracts	6,076,135,000	5,558,106,000	5,558,106,000	4,558,106,000	4,558,106,000	-1,518,029,000
Advance appropriation for next fiscal year	720,000,000	800,000,000	800,000,000		800,000,000	+80,000,000
Rental housing assistance:						
Rescission of budget authority, indefinite	-42,000,000	-40,000,000	-40,000,000	-40,000,000	-40,000,000	+2,000,000
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	
Rescission of prepayment recaptures	-283,000,000	-45,515,000	-45,515,000	-45,515,000	-45,515,000	+237,485,000
Rent supplement program:						
Rescission of budget authority, indefinite		-32,438,000	-32,438,000	-32,438,000	-32,438,000	-32,438,000
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite)		(-1,544,646)	(-1,544,646)	(-1,544,646)	(-1,544,646)	(-1,544,646)
Congregate services	21,000,000	6,267,000	6,267,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	+4,000,000
Payments for operation of low-income housing projects	2,282,436,000	2,520,808,000	2,620,808,000	2,620,808,000	2,620,808,000	+338,372,000
Severely distressed public housing	300,000,000	483,240,000	483,240,000	803,240,000	776,240,000	+476,240,000
Drug elimination grants for low-income housing	175,000,000		265,000,000	265,000,000	265,000,000	+90,000,000
Community partnerships against crime		265,000,000				
Youthbuild program	40,000,000	48,000,000	48,000,000			-40,000,000
National cities in schools community development program			10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	+10,000,000
Housing counseling assistance	6,025,000		12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	+5,975,000
Flexible subsidy fund		65,747,000	35,747,000	41,000,000	35,747,000	+35,747,000
Rescission	-10,800,000					+10,800,000
Flexible subsidy fund (transfer to annual contributions)	-55,500,000					+55,500,000
Nehemiah housing opportunity fund (transfer to annual contri- butions)	-18,934,000					+18,934,000
Federal Housing Administration:						
FHA - Mutual mortgage insurance program account:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(100,000,000,000)	(64,564,645,000)	(64,564,645,000)	(64,564,645,000)	(64,564,645,000)	(-35,435,355,000)
Administrative expenses	255,645,000	262,810,000	262,810,000	262,810,000	262,810,000	+7,165,000
Offsetting receipts	-261,148,000	-267,021,000	-267,021,000	-267,021,000	-267,021,000	-5,873,000
FHA - General and special risk program account:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(10,964,230,000)	(13,436,205,000)	(13,436,205,000)	(13,436,205,000)	(13,436,205,000)	(+2,771,975,000)
Administrative expenses	187,000,000	192,252,000	192,252,000	192,252,000	192,252,000	+5,252,000
Program costs	145,823,000	147,371,000	147,371,000	147,371,000	147,371,000	+1,548,000
Subsidy - multifamily		-41,957,000	-41,957,000	-41,957,000	-41,957,000	-41,957,000
Subsidy - single family		-45,172,000	-45,172,000	-45,172,000	-45,172,000	-45,172,000
Subsidy - Title I		-16,293,000	-16,293,000	-16,293,000	-16,293,000	-16,293,000
Offsetting receipts	-22,171,000					+22,171,000
Raise FHA mortgage limitation	-44,000,000					+44,000,000
Eliminate 57% closing cost limitation	1,000,000					-1,000,000
Total, Federal Housing Administration	262,149,000	231,990,000	231,990,000	231,990,000	231,990,000	-30,159,000
Government National Mortgage Association						
Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(107,700,000,000)	(85,000,000,000)	(85,000,000,000)	(130,000,000,000)	(130,000,000,000)	(+22,300,000,000)
Administrative expenses	6,936,000	8,038,000	8,038,000	8,038,000	8,038,000	+1,102,000
Offsetting receipts	-322,500,000	-269,300,000	-269,300,000	-269,300,000	-269,300,000	+53,200,000
Total, Housing Programs (net)	19,462,112,000	19,732,133,000	20,079,033,000	18,657,019,000	19,404,766,000	-57,348,000
Homeless Assistance						
Emergency shelter grants program	50,000,000	51,350,000	151,350,000	55,000,000	115,000,000	+65,000,000
Supportive housing program	150,000,000	319,968,000	319,968,000	400,000,000	334,000,000	+184,000,000
Section 8 moderate rehabilitation, single room occupancy	105,000,000	107,835,000	107,835,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	+45,000,000
Shelter plus care	266,550,000	273,747,000	123,747,000	123,747,000	123,747,000	-142,803,000
Innovative homeless initiatives demonstrations program					100,000,000	+100,000,000
Total	571,550,000	752,900,000	702,900,000	728,747,000	822,747,000	+251,197,000
Community Planning and Development						
Community development grants	4,240,000,000	4,223,675,000	4,273,675,000	4,400,000,000	4,400,000,000	+160,000,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(2,000,000,000)	(2,054,000,000)	(2,054,000,000)	(2,054,000,000)	(2,054,000,000)	(+54,000,000)
Capacity building for community development and affordable housing					20,000,000	+20,000,000
Total	4,240,000,000	4,223,675,000	4,273,675,000	4,400,000,000	4,420,000,000	+180,000,000
Policy Development and Research						
Research and technology	25,000,000	35,000,000	73,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	+10,000,000

H.R. 2491 - Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies, 1994

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Indian Housing						
Indian housing loan guarantee program.....			2,000,000		1,000,000	+ 1,000,000
(Limitation on direct loans).....			(50,000,000)		(25,000,000)	(+ 25,000,000)
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity						
Fair housing activities.....	15,000,000	21,419,000	25,000,000	21,419,000	25,000,000	+ 10,000,000
Management and Administration						
Salaries and expenses (multiple accounts).....	452,567,000	465,553,000	465,553,000	458,000,000	464,053,000	+ 11,486,000
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds).....	(432,497,000)	(444,872,000)	(444,872,000)	(444,872,000)	(444,872,000)	(+ 12,375,000)
(By transfer, GNMA).....	(8,936,000)	(8,036,000)	(8,036,000)	(8,036,000)	(8,036,000)	(+ 1,102,000)
Office of Inspector General.....	36,012,000	36,149,000	36,115,000	36,115,000	36,115,000	+ 103,000
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds).....	(10,148,000)	(10,180,000)	(10,180,000)	(10,180,000)	(10,180,000)	(+ 42,000)
Office of federal housing enterprise oversight.....		5,742,000	5,742,000	10,700,000	10,700,000	+ 10,700,000
Offsetting receipts.....		-5,742,000	-5,742,000	-10,700,000	-10,700,000	-10,700,000
Administrative provisions.....	3,579,000					-3,579,000
Total, title II, Dept of Housing and Urban Development (net)						
Appropriations, fiscal year 1994.....	24,805,820,000	25,266,829,000	25,857,276,000	24,336,300,000	25,208,681,000	+ 402,661,000
Advance appropriations for next year.....	(24,429,620,000)	(24,584,782,000)	(25,225,229,000)	(24,704,253,000)	(24,778,634,000)	(+ 347,014,000)
Rescissions.....	(720,000,000)	(800,000,000)	(800,000,000)		(800,000,000)	(+ 80,000,000)
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite).....	(-343,800,000)	(-117,953,000)	(-367,953,000)	(-367,953,000)	(-367,953,000)	(-24,153,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(-2,000,000)	(-3,544,846)	(-3,544,846)	(-3,544,846)	(-3,544,846)	(-1,544,846)
(Limitation on corporate funds to be expended).....	(220,364,230,000)	(185,054,850,000)	(185,054,850,000)	(210,054,850,000)	(210,054,850,000)	(-10,306,380,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds to be expended).....	(449,581,000)	(463,100,000)	(463,100,000)	(463,100,000)	(463,100,000)	(+ 13,519,000)
Consisting of:						
Advance appropriation available.....	850,000,000	720,000,000	720,000,000	720,000,000	720,000,000	-130,000,000
Appropriations available from this bill.....	24,085,820,000	24,466,829,000	24,857,276,000	24,336,300,000	24,408,681,000	+ 322,661,000
Total, title II, fiscal year 1994.....						
	24,935,820,000	25,186,829,000	25,577,276,000	25,056,300,000	25,128,681,000	+ 182,661,000
TITLE III						
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
American Battle Monuments Commission						
Salaries and expenses.....	19,318,000	19,961,000	19,961,000	20,461,000	20,211,000	+ 893,000
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board						
Salaries and expenses.....		5,000,000	5,000,000		2,500,000	+ 2,500,000
Commission on National and Community Service						
Salaries and expenses.....	2,500,000	2,519,000	2,519,000			-2,500,000
Programs and activities.....	77,000,000	74,871,000	105,000,000			-77,000,000
Total.....						
	79,500,000	77,490,000	107,519,000			-79,500,000
Department of the Treasury						
Financial Management Service: Community development banks						
Community Investment Program						
Community investment program.....		513,500,000				
Consumer Product Safety Commission						
Salaries and expenses.....	48,400,000	42,286,000	42,286,000	42,286,000	42,286,000	-6,114,000
Court of Veterans Appeals						
Salaries and expenses.....	8,480,000	9,278,000	9,040,000	9,278,000	9,159,000	+ 679,000
Department of Defense - Civil						
Cemeterial Expenses, Army						
Salaries and expenses.....	13,033,000	12,738,000	12,738,000	12,738,000	12,738,000	-295,000
Environmental Protection Agency						
Research and development.....	323,000,000	353,565,000	353,565,000	328,565,000	338,701,000	+ 15,701,000
Abatement, control, and compliance.....	1,337,215,000	1,367,535,000	1,367,535,000	1,352,535,000	1,352,535,000	+ 15,320,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(274,000,000)		(283,000,000)	(280,000,000)	(283,000,000)	(+ 9,000,000)
Abatement, control, and compliance loan account.....	30,225,000					-30,225,000
(By transfer).....				(28,000,000)		
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(70,500,000)					(-70,500,000)
Administrative expenses.....	1,000,000					-1,000,000
(By transfer).....				(1,000,000)		
Program and research operations.....	827,807,000	859,170,000	859,170,000	841,000,000	850,625,000	+ 23,018,000
(Transfer to CEQ).....				(-375,000)		
Office of Inspector General.....	42,799,000	45,194,000	44,595,000	44,595,000	44,595,000	+ 1,796,000
Buildings and facilities.....	134,300,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	12,000,000	18,000,000	-116,300,000
Hazardous substance superfund.....	1,573,528,000	1,496,400,000	1,416,100,000	1,496,400,000	1,480,853,000	-92,675,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(260,000,000)		(280,000,000)	(240,000,000)	(280,000,000)	(+ 20,000,000)
Leaking underground storage tank trust fund.....	83,000,000	75,379,000	75,379,000	75,379,000	75,379,000	-7,821,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(7,200,000)		(7,400,000)	(7,400,000)	(7,400,000)	(+ 200,000)

H.R. 2491 - Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies, 1994

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Oil spill response.....	20,700,000	21,239,000	21,239,000	21,239,000	21,239,000	+539,000
Water infrastructure / State revolving fund.....	2,550,000,000	1,528,000,000	2,477,000,000	2,500,000,000	2,477,000,000	-73,000,000
Drinking water capitalization grants.....		599,000,000				
Total, EPA.....	6,923,374,000	6,363,482,000	6,632,583,000	6,671,713,000	6,658,927,000	-284,447,000
Executive Office of the President						
National Space Council.....	941,000					-941,000
Office of Science and Technology Policy.....	6,225,000	5,170,000	4,200,000	4,700,000	4,450,000	-1,775,000
Points of Light Foundation.....	5,000,000					-5,000,000
Office of National Service.....				180,000	180,000	+180,000
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality.....	2,560,000				375,000	-2,185,000
(By transfer).....				(375,000)		
Total.....	14,726,000	5,170,000	4,200,000	4,880,000	4,985,000	-9,741,000
Federal Emergency Management Agency						
Disaster relief.....	2,292,000,000	292,000,000	292,000,000	292,000,000	292,000,000	-2,000,000,000
Disaster relief contingency fund (emergency).....				400,000,000		
Disaster assistance direct loan program account.....	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(40,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(-15,000,000)
Salaries and expenses.....	180,409,000	185,516,000	184,239,000	180,409,000	180,409,000	
Office of Inspector General.....	3,000,000	4,800,000	4,350,000	4,350,000	4,350,000	+1,350,000
Emergency management planning and assistance.....	253,243,000	222,960,000	212,960,000	215,000,000	212,960,000	-40,283,000
Emergency food and shelter program.....	129,000,000	123,000,000	130,000,000	130,000,000	130,000,000	+1,000,000
Administrative provision REP savings.....	-10,477,000	-11,525,000	-11,525,000	-11,525,000	-11,525,000	-1,048,000
Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency.....	2,827,270,000	796,848,000	792,119,000	1,190,329,000	788,289,000	-2,038,961,000
General Services Administration						
Consumer Information Center.....	2,026,000	2,074,000	2,074,000	2,074,000	2,074,000	+48,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(2,367,000)	(2,415,000)	(2,415,000)	(2,415,000)	(2,415,000)	(+48,000)
Department of Health and Human Services						
Office of Consumer Affairs.....	2,159,000	2,159,000	2,159,000	2,159,000	2,159,000	
Interagency Council on the Homeless						
Salaries and expenses.....	900,000	910,000	910,000			-900,000
National Aeronautics and Space Administration						
Research and development.....	7,094,300,000	7,690,400,000	7,475,400,000	7,544,400,000	7,529,300,000	+435,000,000
Rescission.....	-14,300,000					+14,300,000
Total (net).....	7,080,000,000	7,690,400,000	7,475,400,000	7,544,400,000	7,529,300,000	+449,300,000
Space flight, control and data communications.....	5,058,800,000	5,333,800,000	4,878,400,000	4,892,900,000	4,853,500,000	-205,300,000
Construction of facilities.....	520,000,000	550,300,000	512,700,000	550,300,000	517,700,000	-2,300,000
Rescission.....				-10,000,000		
Research and program management.....	1,635,014,000	1,675,000,000	1,637,500,000	1,635,508,000	1,635,508,000	+494,000
Office of Inspector General.....	15,062,000	15,500,000	15,391,000	15,391,000	15,391,000	+329,000
Total, NASA.....	14,308,876,000	15,265,000,000	14,519,391,000	14,628,499,000	14,551,399,000	+242,523,000
National Commission on American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian Housing						
Salaries and expenses.....	500,000					-500,000
National Credit Union Administration						
Central liquidity facility:						
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	
(Limitation on administrative expenses, corporate funds).....	(984,000)	(945,000)	(945,000)	(945,000)	(945,000)	(-19,000)
National Science Foundation						
Research and related activities.....	1,859,000,000	2,204,800,000	2,045,000,000	1,940,000,000	1,998,500,000	+139,500,000
Academic research infrastructure.....	50,000,000	55,000,000	55,000,000	125,000,000	110,000,000	+60,000,000
United States polar research programs.....	158,000,000	163,100,000	158,100,000	158,100,000	158,100,000	+100,000
United States Antarctic logistical support activities.....	63,360,000	65,100,000	62,600,000	62,600,000	62,600,000	-760,000
Education and human resources.....	487,500,000	556,100,000	569,800,000	569,800,000	569,800,000	+82,100,000
Critical technologies institute.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	2,000,000	1,500,000	+500,000
Salaries and expenses.....	111,000,000	125,800,000	120,800,000	115,500,000	118,300,000	+7,300,000
Office of Inspector General.....	3,688,000	4,100,000	3,997,000	3,997,000	3,997,000	+309,000
National Science Foundation headquarters relocation.....		5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	+5,200,000
Total, NSF.....	2,733,548,000	3,180,200,000	3,021,297,000	2,981,997,000	3,027,797,000	+294,249,000
National Service Initiative						
Corporation for National and Community Service.....		394,000,000		370,000,000	370,000,000	+370,000,000

H.R. 2491 - Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies, 1994

	FY 1993 Enacted	FY 1994 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation						
Payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	27,976,000	27,976,000	30,476,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	+4,024,000
Selective Service System						
Salaries and expenses	28,616,000	29,012,000	5,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	-3,616,000
Total, title III, Independent agencies (net)	27,038,702,000	26,807,082,000	25,206,753,000	25,963,394,000	25,549,524,000	-1,489,178,000
Appropriations	(27,053,002,000)	(26,807,082,000)	(25,206,753,000)	(26,003,394,000)	(25,549,524,000)	(-1,503,478,000)
Rescissions	(-14,300,000)			(-10,000,000)		(+14,300,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(543,567,000)	(2,415,000)	(572,815,000)	(529,815,000)	(572,815,000)	(+29,248,000)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(710,500,000)	(625,000,000)	(625,000,000)	(625,000,000)	(625,000,000)	(-85,500,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds to be expended)	(984,000)	(945,000)	(945,000)	(945,000)	(945,000)	(-19,000)
TITLE IV						
CORPORATIONS						
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation:						
FSLIC Resolution Fund	2,622,000,000	1,326,000,000	1,326,000,000	1,171,000,000	1,171,000,000	-1,451,000,000
FDIC affordable housing program	5,000,000	5,260,000	7,000,000		7,000,000	+2,000,000
Bank enterprise program	1,000,000					-1,000,000
Total	2,628,000,000	1,331,260,000	1,333,000,000	1,171,000,000	1,178,000,000	-1,450,000,000
Resolution Trust Corporation: Office of Inspector General						
	33,510,000	34,582,000	34,046,000	34,582,000	34,314,000	+804,000
Total, title IV, Corporations	2,661,510,000	1,365,842,000	1,367,046,000	1,205,582,000	1,212,314,000	-1,448,196,000
Grand total (net)	89,557,933,000	89,268,383,032	87,946,121,032	87,931,529,032	87,835,272,032	-1,722,660,968
Appropriations, fiscal year 1994	(89,196,033,000)	(88,566,336,032)	(87,514,074,032)	(88,309,482,032)	(87,403,225,032)	(-1,792,807,968)
Advance appropriations for next year	(720,000,000)	(800,000,000)	(800,000,000)		(800,000,000)	(+80,000,000)
Rescissions	(-358,100,000)	(-117,953,000)	(-367,953,000)	(-377,953,000)	(-367,953,000)	(-9,853,000)
(By transfer)	(57,000)	(14,059,000)	(14,059,000)	(44,434,000)	(14,059,000)	(+14,002,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(543,567,000)	(2,415,000)	(572,815,000)	(529,815,000)	(572,815,000)	(+29,248,000)
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite)	(-2,000,000)	(-3,544,846)	(-3,544,846)	(-3,544,846)	(-3,544,846)	(-1,544,846)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(771,888,000)	(629,258,571)	(679,258,571)	(629,258,571)	(654,258,571)	(-117,629,429)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(220,384,230,000)	(185,054,850,000)	(185,054,850,000)	(210,054,850,000)	(210,054,850,000)	(-10,309,380,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds to be expended)	(450,545,000)	(464,045,000)	(464,045,000)	(464,045,000)	(464,045,000)	(+13,500,000)

□ 1450

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to express my appreciation to my chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], for his very, very fine and professional working relationship which he has developed among the entire staff as well as the members of our subcommittee.

I further would like to express my own appreciation for the fine work of Bill Warfield, who is with the office of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE], and who has been of great assistance to me and my staff in our work throughout this year. Finally I'd like to recognize the work of Doc Syers, and Darin Latteed of my personal staff, who have done so much in helping us work our way through this new responsibility in this subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, we bring to you today a conference report which allocates \$87.7 billion in new budget authority among two Cabinet agencies and 19 other Federal agencies and commissions.

Within these accounts we are allocating \$68.2 billion in discretionary domestic budget authority for programs as diverse as America's Space Program, the consumer information catalog, enforcement of the Clean Air Act, America's research stations on the continent of Antarctica, and efforts to address our obligation to America's veterans.

In light of your strong and overwhelming vote on last week's rule, we have revised the agreement to clearly and unambiguously terminate the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor Program. We have adopted the reduced ASRM funding level that was contained in the bill upon original House passage in late June.

This conference report is also unambiguous in its effort to provide new leadership to address long-simmering controversies. My chairman, Mr. STOKES, has worked long and hard to minimize the kinds of communication difficulties with the various authorizing committees which also have jurisdiction and oversight over the many agencies and programs that are covered within this bill.

This conference agreement is distinctive for what it does not do.

It does not fund HUD special purpose grants which have totalled as much as \$250 million in recent years.

It does not earmark funds for unauthorized site specific Member initiated EPA water projects.

It does not contain more overall spending than last year's bill. We are \$1.8 billion below the bill as enacted last year. We are also nearly \$1.6 billion below what the President requested.

We have taken a firm step toward ending any debates about the search

for extra terrestrial intelligence. This report phases out that research.

Let me return now to highlighting some of what we have been able to do.

VETERANS

Whatever else you may hear during the next year regarding veterans and where they will fit into comprehensive health care reform, your approval of this conference report means that the VA's system of 171 hospitals, 131 nursing homes and 371 outpatient clinics will receive a 7-percent increase or almost \$977 million most to operate with than last year. Just as critical, we have provided \$252 million—an increase of nearly 9 percent—for the high quality medical research that attracts and retains professionals and practitioners to the VA's health care delivery system.

HOUSING

We have provided \$20.1 billion to HUD for housing programs. You may hear more later regarding the shift in emphasis from promoting ownership in public housing by the residents to the programs that Secretary Cisneros and the new administration hopes will lead to reinventing HUD. Major innovations in housing policy are largely in the future but this report reserves its most substantial increases to reconstruction and job training in severely distressed public housing—plus \$478 million or plus 159 percent versus fiscal year 1993—drug elimination grants—less \$90 million or plus 51 percent—and programs to assist the homeless—plus \$151.2 million or plus 26.4 percent. We have also provided funds to begin implementing the new Secretary's top two initiatives—innovative homeless demonstrations and capacity building in community development. These two programs were authorized in final form by this House less than 1 week ago.

SPACE

Your support for this conference agreement means that America has a future in space and that NASA will live within the President's cap of \$2.1 billion to continue the Space Station Program. You cannot tie a better square knot than we did in this report. Let me state it to you in the exact way our report does. "The Conferees believe that any Russian participation should enhance and not enable station." We have an agreement with the Administrator that over 50 percent of the station funds can not be spent until the Russian role as a potential international partner is negotiated and finalized.

EPA

We have provided \$6.6 billion for environmental protection. This actually reflects a reduction of 3.6 percent for this agency compared to last year. We have provided \$500 million to support water infrastructure financing in hardship communities. Not one dime of that money is committed to a site specific Member requested project. That is a

departure from past practice in this Appropriations Subcommittee. We strongly urge the authorizers to help us make use of these funds and to take timely action to prioritize the multiple requests that we received.

I urge your strong support for both the programmatic directions we have achieved and for the direction that the subcommittee is taking under the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio. We very much want a bill signed that reflects the will of this body.

□ 1500

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today not so much to oppose the conference committee report but to urge the membership to support the motion that will be offered later on today by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] to finally terminate the advanced solid rocket motor.

The ASRM was funded in the conference report at \$157 million. The language of the Stokes motion will be to provide \$100 million of expressly stated termination costs. If the Stokes motion is passed by the House, which I hope it will be, that will put the Congress in an appropriation bill firmly on record for terminating this boondoggle that has increased in cost almost exponentially from the time it was originally authorized, dividing up the other \$57 million as follows: to fund research on the national aerospace plane, \$20 million, and a transfer to the accounts National Science Foundation and the Environmental Protection Agency, \$37 million.

By terminating the ASRM, NASA, the National Science Foundation, and the EPA will be better off and will be able to use the money that is transferred away from the ASRM to do what in my opinion is probably a better public good.

Mr. Speaker, the question has been asked by many of my fellow fiscal conservatives: Why not just reduce the total appropriation by \$57 million, and let this money go?

Unfortunately, the way our Budget Act works is that since this is included under a section 602(b) allocation, we just cannot have money lying around. However, that is not a reason to defeat the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES]. The reason to pass that motion is, by terminating the ASRM, the \$2.6 billion that is necessary to complete this project between now and the year 2002 will not have to be appropriated in future years. By spending the \$57 million in programs in NASA, the National Science Foundation, and the EPA today, we will be able to save many times that in future appropriation bills for the next seven to eight years.

The Advanced solid rocket motor needs to be terminated because it is 100 percent over budget. It now bears a \$2.6 billion cost to complete, after we have spent \$2 billion over the past 5 years. The cost to finish this program is more than the original cost estimates that were given to the Congress when the program was initially authorized and appropriated, and it is very similar to the superconducting super collider in terms of lowball estimates that Congress is being asked to agree to.

The advanced solid rocket motor will not fly even its first flight until the year 2002, after 80 percent of the space station has been completed. The proponents of the ASRM, when the program was originally authorized, said, "We need this rocket in order to reduce the number of shuttle flights necessary to assemble the station." Because this rocket is not going to be ready until most of the station is already up, it has become a rocket without a mission. That is why its funding ought to be terminated.

There were and there still are alternative programs that NASA can afford to do the job of the ASRM. That is something that is funded in this current budget, and which will be considered in future authorizations and appropriation bills.

Finally, the facilities at Yellow Creek, MS; can and should be used for a worthy public purpose, since the taxpayers have already invested \$1.5 billion in constructing them, but that worthy public purpose is not the advanced solid rocket motor, nor is it some kind of resurrection or job transfer program.

The President, in his fiscal year 1995 budget submission, ought to tell Congress and the country for what purpose he intends to use that facility. If it is reasonable and does not attempt to resurrect the ASRM out of the ashes, I am certain that it will achieve support, both in the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, in the Committee on Appropriations, and by the House of Representatives as a whole.

Again, I would urge strong support for the motion terminating the ASRM that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will offer later on today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished ranking majority member of this subcommittee, the very able and hard-working gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report to H.R. 2491, the VA-HUD fiscal year 1994 appropriations bill. The chairman has done an outstanding job throughout the appropriations process this year, and he has enjoyed the cooperation of the ranking minority member. I am very proud of the prod-

uct that we bring to the floor for the Members' consideration.

In light of the current budget environment, we were unable to fund many worthy projects, and others we funded at lower levels than we would have hoped. But in this fiscal situation, the operative word is fair, and this is a fair bill.

The programs in this bill have been authorized. The initiatives reflect the administration's priorities for the diverse agencies under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

To address the critical needs of our Nation's veterans, I am pleased to tell my colleagues that we increased funding for veterans medical care by almost \$1 billion over fiscal year 1993 amounts. This was not easy because our 602b allocation provided a funding level 2 percent less than comparable fiscal year 1993 levels.

By providing increases in Housing and Urban Development accounts the bill renews our commitment to public housing programs. I am particularly pleased that we keep in mind the special needs of rural areas. Through the increase to the Section 8 Program we improve the availability of affordable housing for the many low-income individuals waiting for assistance.

In NASA, we have successfully achieved funding for a balanced Space Program. We have included the requested amount for the redesigned space station *Alpha*, which now includes Russian participation; we have provided increases for aeronautics research and development, a key component of President Clinton's competitiveness agenda; further, we have maintained the Nation's commitment to the space shuttle, mission to planet Earth, and space science programs.

The committee appreciates the importance of basic research, so we have provided increases for the National Science Foundation's research and related activities account. And we again increase funding for NSF's K through 12 education activities.

And we provide levels for EPA above the President's request, including funds for water treatment, Superfund, leaking underground storage tank fund, and oilspill response programs.

Overall, I am pleased with our work, but I would like to take this opportunity to mention something that concerns me deeply. The Congress is responding to the current fiscal environment with a shifting mood about discretionary spending, but in our frenzy to appear fiscally responsible, we must refrain from superficial tactics to achieve our goals.

The high-resolution microwave survey is a NASA Program caught in this web. As a result, the program is being terminated in this bill. If this termination had been based on substantive issues, I would be comfortable with our actions. But unfortunately, this is not

the case. HRMS has been peer reviewed; it has been authorized; it pushes state of the art technology in signal processing techniques and in radio receiver technology; and it has met its budget and its schedule for the 5 years it has been funded.

Yet in an attempt to attract attention as stewards of good government, Members of Congress have attacked the program with shallow references to little green men and ET. In my judgment, the termination of this program is a mistake. The program is being used as a scapegoat, and I want to express my sincere regret to the outstanding scientists who have dedicated their careers to the program.

Overall, however, we bring to you a responsible bill. The subcommittee has been responsive to the will of the majority of the Members of the body. I urge my colleagues to support this conference agreement.

□ 1510

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN].

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, within the funds for NASA, the conference report directs a reduction from the NASA ground terminal facility which lies within my district. Is this correct?

Mr. STOKES. If the gentleman will yield, that is correct. The conference report reflects the sentiment of the conferees that we are not proceeding with the TDRSS replenishment new start at this time. The conference agreement reflects a specific reduction in the operating costs at both headquarters and the ground terminal.

Mr. SKEEN. Owing to my concern with the intent of the conferees, I wrote NASA Administrator Goldin asking for an agency assessment of the technical feasibility of operating cuts such as those which the conferees have reached. His response raises possible concerns and I insert Mr. Goldin's letter into the RECORD at this point.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE
ADMINISTRATION, OFFICE OF THE
ADMINISTRATOR,

Washington, DC, October 15, 1993.

Hon. JOE SKEEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SKEEN: Thank you for your letter of October 7, signed jointly with Senators Domenici, Gramm and Bingaman and Congressmen McDade and Lewis, regarding direction concerning NASA's Space Communications activities included in the Conference Report (House Report 103-273) accompanying H.R. 2491, the VA-HUD-Independent Agencies appropriations bill. The Report directs that "\$11 million [be taken] as a general reduction from space communications, including a reduction of \$8.6 million from

space communications operations activities at headquarters and at the NASA ground terminal."

We are currently assessing the impacts of an \$8.6 million reduction directed at Headquarters support activities for Space Communications and Ground Terminal operations. As you may know, NASA is already actively endeavoring to reduce costs of Headquarters support activities in general, and we expect to absorb reductions in Headquarters support for Space Communications, among other areas. Clearly, however, a directed appropriations reduction of \$8.6 million would require a decrease in activities at the NASA Ground Terminal in White Sands, New Mexico, as well. We recognize the important role of the White Sands Ground Terminal in the operation and maintenance of the Tracking and Data Relay Satellite (TDRS) system, and hope to avoid undue impacts of reductions in Ground Terminal funding. We are evaluating how NASA might absorb a portion of the reduction specified in the Conference Report in other elements of the Space Communications program, if necessary. If it is determined that an alternative distribution of the reductions is preferable for the most effective conduct of Space Communications activities, NASA will propose such an approach in the FY 1994 operating plan.

With respect to the TDRS Replenishment program, I note that the Conference Report deletes requested FY 1994 funding "without prejudice." We are actively studying the cost, schedule, and capability requirements to ensure continuity of vital U.S. on-orbit space communications availability through the TDRS replenishment program. As the Conference Report suggests, NASA will address the results of our studies in this regard and timing of procurement activities in the forthcoming FY 1994 operating plan.

NASA is committed to maintaining the viability of TDRSS. I appreciate your support of NASA's space communications activities and would be pleased to discuss this matter in greater detail.

Sincerely,

DANIEL S. GOLDIN,
Administrator.

Mr. Goldin's letter states that NASA recognizes the importance of the White Sands ground terminal in the operation and maintenance of the Tracking and Data Relay Satellite System [TDRSS] and stresses the agency hopes to avoid undue impacts of reductions in ground terminal funding.

I would like to ask the conferees an important question on this matter. Is it the subcommittee's intent to eliminate any flexibility by the Administrator of NASA with regard to the operating budget at the White Sands location?

Mr. LEWIS of California. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, the potential technical problems which the Administrator mentions creates a very limited opportunity for us to assess whether the agency could faithfully implement the clear direction of the conferees. That would come at a later date in the form of a reprogramming or when the agency's operating plan is forwarded to us in the next few months.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is correct.

Mr. SKEEN. I thank both the chairman and the ranking member for their responses.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the short-winded gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the compliment of my colleague from Wisconsin. I guess that was a compliment.

Mr. Speaker, you know this conference committee report is 2.1 percent below fiscal year 1993, and that is good. It is 1.8 percent below the President's request for 1994, and that is good. It is 1 percent below the House-passed bill, and that is good. It is 1 percent below the Senate-passed bill. All of those things are good.

Unfortunately, it is \$400 million higher than fiscal year 1993's spending for community development block grants, \$400 million higher. We tried when this bill came before the House on June 28 to take community development block grants back to the level of last year and we were unsuccessful.

Now the conference committee has raised it \$400 million to \$4.4 billion, and it is higher by 10 percent than last year.

At a time when we are suffering huge budget deficits, it seems to me inconceivable that we would be increasing any part of our spending, even in this bill, by 10 percent or \$400 million.

Earlier this year when President Clinton first took office he proposed what was called his economic stimulus package. That was a \$16.5 billion package that was supposed to create jobs for this country. And in that package we found all kinds of pork barrel projects.

We found, for instance, \$1.8 million for a Desert West Park in Phoenix, AZ, the Orpheum Theater in Phoenix, AZ, where the renovation of that movie theater would cost \$3.5 million of taxpayers' money. In Berkeley, CA, there was the downtown YMCA that was going to cost \$300,000 to renovate, and the Civic Center in Burbank was going to cost \$400 million to renovate, and it goes on and on. I brought to the floor this litany of pork barrel projects at that time. And we sent this to the Senate, and that was the thing that defeated that bill.

Unfortunately, we cannot get to a lot of these that are in this bill today, but many of these projects I believe are the same projects that were in the so-called economic stimulus package, and they are simply nothing more than pork barrel projects.

So I say to my colleagues that I cannot support this because there is \$400 million more in this bill than was spent last year for community development block grants. And I believe many of these projects are simply pork barrel projects for incumbent Congressmen so that they can go back home and say to

their constituents that they have done a good job by bringing home the bacon, and thus getting reelected. This is the wrong thing to do during these fiscal problems. We face fiscal collapse in this country if we do not get control of our appetite for spending. This is a perfect example of that.

Ten years ago we had a \$1 trillion debt. Now it is \$4.35 trillion, and projections are that it will be close to \$7 trillion in the next 4 or 5 years, and the interest on that debt alone is going to be one of the largest items in the Federal budget. We cannot afford it. We have to get control of spending. This is an example of waste we should not be voting for, and I urge my colleagues to defeat this conference report, send it back, and take \$400 million out.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report's allocation for the Environmental Protection Agency's research and development activities contains a specific allocation for high-altitude engine research and testing. Is it the intention of the committee that these funds are to be used only for statutorily authorized high-altitude engine research and testing?

Mr. STOKES. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, that is the committee's intention.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman. I just wanted to get that clarified for the RECORD, and I appreciate the work of the gentleman and his committee on this bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to the fiscal year 1994 VA, HUD, independent agencies appropriation bill. I do so in large part due to the continued funding for the space station.

However, I want to take this opportunity to personally commend Chairman NATCHER and ranking member MCDADE as well as Chairman STOKES and ranking member LEWIS of the VA-HUD Subcommittee for their efforts with respect to our Nation's housing programs.

With respect to this bill, I appreciate the difficult job the members of the Appropriations Committee face in trying to provide a fair distribution of very limited funds.

I want to especially commend the committee for the increased funding for the HOME Investment Partnership Program, the 202 elderly, and section 811 disabled program, the public housing development and modernization programs.

I also want to thank the committee for providing \$150 million for the much

needed lead paint abatement program and the \$700 million for the distressed public housing effort.

I also appreciate the fact that the committee recognized the great needs in the HUD-FHA multifamily property disposition program by providing \$500 million for the sale of these properties. The authorization committees of both Houses will be making substantial changes to that program over the next few months in order to help HUD expedite the sale of these properties.

Finally, to Chairman STOKES and ranking member LEWIS, I want to again thank you for taking the authorization committee's wishes into consideration with respect to several housing initiatives presented by HUD earlier this spring. These include the pension fund housing demonstration and the innovative homeless initiative.

The spirit of cooperation between authorizers and appropriators is very much appreciated. Last week, the House did pass the necessary authorization legislation and HUD can now go forward with their programs.

Unfortunately, and despite the good work of the committee in addressing our housing needs, I must vote against this conference report because we continue to skew our priorities toward outer space rather than toward deficit reduction and our domestic needs.

□ 1520

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

First of all I would just like to say to the chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies, as well as to my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the ranking member, that I again want to commend them for the work that they and their staff do along with the other committee members.

Theirs is one of the most difficult jobs in the entire Congress. When you have the Veterans Department and all of the veterans programs lumped under that subcommittee, along with Housing and Urban Development, which is a huge department in itself, and the myriad other independent agencies, their job in distributing the limited pie of funds available is very, very difficult.

I, for one, deeply appreciate what they have done over the years for our veterans. I really wish that the subcommittee could be divided in half and that we would have a separate subcommittee on veterans' affairs so that the veterans programs would not have to compete with all of the other agencies.

Be that as it may, you folks do a great job. Unfortunately, I had to vote against this bill back on June 28 because it abolished the Selective Service

System, which I feel so strongly about. Now here we are back again, with an amendment in disagreement on the Selective Service System. At the appropriate time I will be offering a preferential motion to recede to the Senate position. However, due to the strange parliamentary situation we have here, we will have to vote on the conference report itself prior to taking up the amendments in disagreement. So I am put again in the uncomfortable position of having to vote against the conference report, which I strongly support. A great job is done for our veterans in this legislation. But I cannot contribute to abolishing the Selective Service System.

I just wanted to explain that. I hope that the House is going to use the wisdom of Solomon and reverse its earlier decision and restore the funds for Selective Service that were deleted some weeks ago. Perhaps today, we will change that around and we will be successful.

Mr. Speaker, again I commend the gentleman from California for yielding this time and congratulate him and the subcommittee chairman for the great work their subcommittee does.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES], a very important member of the subcommittee.

Mr. TORRES. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I note the conference agreement earmarks \$28 million of funds provided under HOPE I, II, and III for YouthBuild Programs authorized under title I, subtitle D of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992. Are these funds subject to any restriction, or can they be used to implement any of the activities contained in the authorizing statute, including the funding of new programs?

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TORRES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the funds appropriated to YouthBuild under HOPE I, II, III may be used to implement any activity authorized under title I, subtitle D of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992, including, but not limited to, the funding of new programs.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for that clarification.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLO], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. GALLO. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2491, the VA, HUD appropriations bill.

As a new member of this subcommittee, I want to congratulate our new

chairman LOUIS STOKES, and our new ranking member JERRY LEWIS, on a job well done.

There are many important priorities in this bill—veterans health care, housing assistance, environmental protections, and space programs. And, as always, there never seems to be enough money to meet all the needs. But, I believe this conference report made the tough choices and found the appropriate balance of funding for all these needs.

In particular, I am very pleased that under the Department of Housing and Urban Development, we provided the higher figure of \$1.567 billion and 12,000 units for section 202/811 senior citizen and disabled housing. I remain concerned, however, about the need to address the problem of mixed populations—nonsenior disabled people living in elderly housing—in HUD-assisted housing. It is my understanding that this is an issue for consideration in the authorization committees, and I hope that other members of the subcommittee will work with me to encourage the authorizing committee to find a long-term solution to preserving senior housing projects for their intended use—low-income seniors.

I also remain concerned about a provision in the conference agreement that requires HUD to set aside no less than 75 percent of the drug elimination grants for housing authorities with over 1,240 units. While I appreciate the needs of the larger housing authorities, I know of no geographic boundaries for this Nation's drug and crime problems and smaller housing authorities are often in even greater need of this assistance. In fact, those housing authorities with less than 1,240 units actually represent 43 percent of all public housing units. It seems unfair to me that these housing authorities would be limited to only 20 percent of these critical funds. Once again, I encourage the authorizing committee to move forward on a long-term solution to address the needs of all public housing authorities when it comes to keeping these homes free and clear of drugs and crime.

Under the Veterans' Administration, I am pleased that the conference agreement provides funding for all major construction projects requested by the administration and authorized by Congress this year.

Finally, I support the conference level of funding for Superfund. As a Member who represents a district that includes 12 civilian and 1 military Superfund site, I am extremely concerned that the funding is available to keep these cleanups on schedule and to protect the health and environment of our citizens and our communities.

Mr. Speaker, again, I support this conference agreement and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of its passage.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD].

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to put the final nail in the coffin of the ASRM by voting for the Stokes motion.

I would like to thank the Committee on Appropriations for agreeing to follow the will of the House to end this program that resembles the celebrated cat with nine lives.

It is hard to believe that the ASRM, which had virtually no support in the Congress or even at NASA and is clearly one of the most blatant examples of pork-barrel spending, too so long to kill.

After the House voted overwhelmingly to terminate the ASRM earlier this summer, the other body and the conference committee unfortunately tried to restore enough funding to keep the program alive. But it is gratifying that the House finally said enough is enough and refused to allow its will to be steamrollered.

But I must say I am disappointed that the money for the ASRM has been placed in other space and science programs. It is my judgment and the judgment of many, many Americans that these savings should have been placed directly in deficit reduction, which is certainly a greater need than the national aerospace plane. But that is a fight for another day.

Mr. Speaker, today's action is the first step on the long road of eliminating wasteful spending, and I only hope my colleagues will cut more pork to eliminate the deficit and to address the national debt before it is too late.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to congratulate both the chairman and the ranking member for the work they have done on this bill, a very difficult, contentious bill, as I know it always is because of the multiplicity of the programs involved.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to protest the death blow dealt the Homeownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere [HOPE] Program by the VA-HUD conference report.

On June 29, the House voted in favor of a bipartisan Kolbe-Andrews-Blackwell amendment which restored \$10 million to HOPE for a total funding level of \$119 million. Regrettably, the Senate deleted this restored funding and voted to fund the HOPE Program at \$109 million.

However, the conference report contains a provision to rip yet another \$12 million from the HOPE Program and transfer it into the Youthbuild Program.

This leaves the HOPE Program with a measly \$97 million.

This provision to transfer \$12 million from HOPE to Youthbuild was not contained in either the House or Senate version of the VA-HUD appropriations bill. It is a Senate subcommittee amendment which was put in the conference report without debate or votes by Members in the House and Senate.

Neither the House nor Senate have adequately funded HOPE, but at least procedure was followed in getting these figures. Unfortunately, that was not the case when this provision to slash an additional \$12 million from HOPE was surreptitiously inserted into the VA-HUD conference report.

The HOPE Program has been decimated by cuts and rescissions. If we fund the HOPE Program at the Senate level of \$109 million, HOPE will be 90 percent below the fiscal year 1994 authorization level.

This means 45,000 low-income residents participating in HOPE will be forced to forgo dreams of homeownership. Imagine how many more residents will be left holding the bag with this additional \$12 million cut from HOPE.

Congress has done a great disservice to low-income residents who want to pursue the American dream of homeownership—and we have effectively provided people with yet another reason to distrust lawmakers.

To further cut the HOPE Program is disheartening and it is wrong to put a provision into the VA-HUD conference report to further slash HOPE without allowing Members to debate the merits of this provision.

□ 1530

That means 45,000 low-income residents participating in HOPE will be forced to forego their dreams of homeownership.

I am very disappointed with the decision that has been taken here, and I hope the House will reject this conference report.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the committee chairman has yielded time to me so that I might enter into a colloquy with him regarding the language in the statement of the managers' accompanying the conference report concerning the requirements of the Clean Air Act for use of oxygenated fuels as applied in Alaska.

The report language states that "The limitation precludes enforcement of section 211(m)(2) of the Clean Air Act against marketers, refiners, or distributors of gasoline to require use of oxygenated substances."

The limitation in this bill, however, does not apply to all oxygenates—as

the report language I have just read states. Instead, it applies only to a single statutorily specified oxygenate, methyl tertiary butyl ether or MTBE. No limitation applies to other fuel oxygenates.

May I ask the gentleman, am I correct?

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. The limitation applies only to a single statutorily specified oxygenate for Alaska. This entire provision concerns the unique conditions in Alaska only.

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank the chairman for helping to clarify that important point. Finally, I would also like to address the issue of further research on oxygenates. I wish to put into the RECORD, an October 8, 1993, letter I received from the acting head of the Office of Research and Development at EPA, Dr. Gary Foley, on this matter.

I thank the subcommittee chairman for his cooperation on this issue, and I include with my remarks the following correspondence:

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT,

Washington, DC, October 8, 1993.

Hon. HENRY A. WAXMAN,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, Committee on Energy and Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in response to your inquiry to Dr. Peter Preuss, Director of the Office of Science, Planning and Regulatory Evaluation in the Office of Research and Development at EPA, regarding language that accompanies the FY 1994 Appropriations Bill.

Currently, the language reads:

"The Office of Research and Development at the EPA believes that additional research on oxygenates would be useful and oxygenate fuels should be investigated before being introduced into commercial application."

We believe that the following sentence would accurately reflect the analyses of the Office of Research and Development to this point.

"The Office of Research and Development at the EPA believes that additional research on oxygenated would be useful and other oxygenates fuels should be investigated."

We hope that this provides the clarification that you requested.

Sincerely yours,

GARY J. FOLEY,

Acting Assistant Administrator
for Research and Development.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the VA-HUD conference report. This is a tough bill working under a tight budget allocation. Balancing the diverse priorities contained in this funding bill from Veterans and Housing needs to EPA, NASA, and Selective Service to name a few, is a very difficult and challenging task.

I am pleased that the total budget authority level in this year's bill is lower than last year. Last year's bill in budget authority amounted to just over \$89.5 billion—\$89,557,933,000—while this year's fiscal year 1994 bill is just under \$87.7 billion—\$87,695,272,032.

I would like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee and our ranking member, the gentleman from California, for the impressive manner in which they have guided this bill through the appropriations process. They have been fair and accommodating and I have thoroughly enjoyed working with both of them.

I very much appreciate the chairman's candor and openness in dealing with funding for NASA and the space station in particular as well as the ranking member's continued strong support. This has been a challenging year for the space station in terms of the redesign, management restructuring, and the question of Russian involvement.

I must admit, I was skeptical at first, but I am confident that we now, under the conception of space station *Alpha*, have the plan for a better, cheaper streamlined version of space station *Freedom* with the option of entering into some form of a partnership with the Russians yet to be decided.

While total funding for the space station amounts to \$2.1 billion, the subcommittee has included a provision which caps the amount available to NASA at \$1.1 billion through March 31, 1994. At that point, the subcommittee can give NASA approval to spend the balance pending final approval of the plan for Russian involvement.

I believe this is a very important restriction. While the prospect of major cooperation with the Russians seems to be around the corner, entering into such a partnership brings with it many concerns. The provision included by the subcommittee gives members the opportunity to ensure that any joint United States-Russian space station option conforms to the established goals of our current space program as well as ensuring that the plan is supported by the American public.

The redesigned space station *Alpha* will cost less to build but will be comparable in terms of scientific capability. As a result of the redesign, we will save more than \$4 billion over the next 5 years and \$19 billion over the life of the program.

By approving the funding for the space station program, we have recognized the importance of investing in our technological future as well as the hopes and dreams of our children. As I've argued before, and I think most Americans would agree, America's space program is one of the activities we undertake which falls unquestionably into the legitimate purview of our Federal Government.

Forget the unparalleled knowledge about space itself, forget even the new heights of international cooperation and the building of inhabitable structures in space. What you're left with are medical advances, new techniques in air and water purification, improved crystals for electronics, new energy production research, better insight into global ecology, and more than 30,000 other basic applications of science that will improve our productivity, our global competitiveness, our environment, and our everyday lives. Unarguably, these are objectives not only worth achieving, but

achievable only through dedicated initiatives at a Federal level.

I support this conference report and I would urge my colleagues to approve it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me say, it has been expressed a number of times today that this is a very complex bill. It is one that involves funding for programs that range from our efforts in space to the responsibilities of the EPA in terms of the environment. It is a very difficult bill that contains a good deal of discretionary spending.

The work that has been done by the chairman and our staff this year in helping us put together this very carefully balanced bill is very much appreciated by this Member.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to give support to this conference committee report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

I would just concur in the statement just made by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the ranking member of the subcommittee, that this is a good bill. It has been a very difficult bill for us to put together. It is one which we worked on assiduously in order to try to bring back to the House not only a good bill, but a bill that conforms with the rules of the House. I urge all Members to support this bill.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support but with concerns on this conference report which will provide \$87.7 billion for veterans, housing, emergency management, environmental, basic science and NASA programs, and independent agencies for fiscal year 1994. The conferees are bringing to us a bill that is \$1.9 billion less than 1993 funding levels and \$1.6 billion less than requested by the administration for fiscal year 1994. This figure could have been even further reduced had Congress not continued to fund the space station program at \$2.1 billion this year alone, incidentally at the expense of folks back here on the Earth. I'm hopeful that the House position on the Advance Solid Rocket Motor [ASRM] Program will now finally prevail so that we can terminate the program along with the funding for the Selective Service Program.

I support the inclusion of \$379 million in funding for the National Service Initiative, funding for the FDIC Affordable Housing Program, continued funding for veterans benefits and ongoing programs at HUD, the EPA and elsewhere that I think are significant in their contributions.

So many of the programs funded by this legislation are vital to our Nation and its citizens, especially the ongoing housing programs that we are funding at \$19.4 billion in HUD along with the roughly half a million dollars in VA housing programs. We hear frequently cited the reports of people without health insurance. We do not hear as often about the millions who live in substandard housing, paying more than one-half of their in-

come each month for rent, or both. We do not hear as often about the homeless. This bill will help meet some of the housing needs of the people we represent.

The agreement provides higher funding for important housing programs like public housing, including severely distressed public housing, and the CDBG Program. The conference agreement also recognizes the strengths of congregate housing services, providing \$25 million for this program that I am interested in and strongly support. I am pleased at the provision of over \$9 billion for assisted housing, \$265 million for the successful public housing drug elimination grants program and \$32 million for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.

In general, this measure takes a good direction in the funding of homeless assistance programs under this bill. I strongly support the reprogramming of funds from shelter plus care [SPC] to the Emergency Shelter Grants [ESG] Program for a conference level of \$115 million. I also support supportive housing and funding dedicated for the program in the House-passed bill increased from \$150 million last year to \$334 million for fiscal year 1994. The agreement also provides \$130 million for the essential FEMA Emergency Food and Shelter Program.

I am also pleased that we have found a way to fund a deserving program for community-based organizations serving homeless veterans as authorized under sections 3 and 4 of the Homeless Veterans Comprehensive Service Programs Act of 1992.

I am concerned, however about the de-funding the Interagency Council on the Homeless. Eliminating funds for the Interagency Council on the Homeless could cripple efforts to bring and keep all agencies into the circle of responsibility for addressing homelessness. While the Department of Housing and Urban Development has done a good job with their programs, the crisis of homelessness for people is so often not just a housing problem.

The funding for the interagency council cannot be restored here today. Notwithstanding that, we must look to reinstate as soon as possible a true interagency effort to ensure continued accountability and better services for homeless persons from the array of national departments and agencies who have primary on-going responsibility to outreach to the homeless population. Indeed, despite the specific rationale of the Senate report language to which the House is yielding, I must point out to my colleagues that the Gore Report on Reinventing Government actually identifies cross-department initiatives addressing the problems of the homeless as one of its strong organizational recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, I support this conference agreement with some reservations. I continue to question the science fiction-like programs and qualities of programs such as the space station program which is being generously maintained through this appropriation legislation and the ASRM program which shouldn't survive. In such lean budget years, I am really hard pressed to support legislation that provides for the continued cannibalization of our critically important domestic programs on earth for questionable and imagined space science research benefits and programs.

I remain hopeful that our future appropriations measures will see additional funding for assisted housing, section 8 assistance, and public housing as that funding is key to moving beyond the McKinney homeless programs to permanent housing for our citizens. That will only be possible if we can continue to redirect our priorities to address the human deficit which has grown so dramatically over the last decade. To achieve such change we must cut the excess of the space station, the ASRM and other questionable programs, and truly reorder our national priorities.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in reluctant opposition to H.R. 2491, the fiscal year 1994 VA, HUD and independent agencies appropriations bill.

Although I realize the constraints under which the committee finds itself, I believe one serious mistake has been made. The national aerospace plane [NASP] has been canceled.

As my colleagues know, I have been involved in NASP since its days as a top secret program known as Copper Canyon. I strongly believe that this program is absolutely essential for our future aerospace industry and America's aerospace trade surplus. In addition, it is necessary to expand and continue our exploration of the last human frontier—space.

Although I commend the committee for their support for the high speed civil transport. It is a different program than NASP, with different, shorter term goals.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a tragic mistake for America and for mankind. It signals to me that we cannot make even the slightest investment in anything that does not have immediate benefits. Therefore, I must oppose this conference agreement.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, facing a tight budget and a slim 602(b) allocation for over 25 different Federal agencies, the VA—HUD subcommittee has probably done as well as one might expect for veterans programs. However, when considering the inadequate numbers they started with, it is difficult for veterans to be pleased.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that Federal spending for veterans' programs in inflation adjusted dollars has not increased in more than a decade and its overall share of the Federal budget has been steadily eroding. Since 1965, spending for veterans programs increased by a mere 36 percent, while at the same time social welfare spending increased by an astounding 361 percent.

Mr. Speaker, veterans are willing to shoulder their share of deficit reduction. But, I am concerned that we are asking them to shoulder an ever increasing percentage every year.

When measured by 1988 dollars, veterans' programs, are taking a dive. They are not keeping pace with what is required. And the results are becoming ever more obvious in the services provided to our veterans—backlogs are rising and delays are commonplace. The backlog of VA compensation claims is approaching 900,000. By this time next year, it could be well over 1 million. The equipment backlog in VA hospitals is approaching \$1 billion. We can do better for those who sacrificed to preserve America's freedom.

Mr. Speaker, it's a matter of priorities. I have very real concerns about the way tax-

payer dollars are being spent. Tens of billions are going to fund mega science projects, public housing, housing research, education grants, and so-called volunteer programs. All in direct competition against veterans' programs.

I credit the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Stokes] chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and independent agencies and the gentleman from California, JERRY LEWIS, the subcommittee's ranking member for all they were able to do for veterans under difficult circumstances.

However, I stand in opposition to the legislation. I am seriously concerned that this conference report, though written within the budget Congress adopted, is misdirected in its priorities and overspent in too many of its accounts. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises to express his thanks to the distinguished chairman of the VA/HUD/Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. STOKES, the distinguished gentleman from California, the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, Mr. LEWIS, and all of the House conferees on this measure for their efforts to include funding for an Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Program. While the conference report includes only \$1 million for this program—as opposed to the House-passed level of \$2 million—this modest amount will provide an opportunity to start the Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Program so as to prove its benefits to our native American populations who live on Indian reservations and its savings to the American taxpayer.

Because of the efforts of the conferees and their able staff to include funding for this program, Indian families living on tribal trust land, for the first time ever will have an opportunity for home ownership through private home loans.

Mr. Speaker, this Member would again express his gratitude for the efforts of the conferees because of the opportunity those efforts will provide to many native American families across our country.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2491, the Veterans Affairs [VA] and Housing and Urban Development [HUD], and independent agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994.

Agencies that H.R. 2491 funds, in addition to the VA and HUD, include the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA], the National Aeronautics and Space Administration [NASA], the National Science Foundation [NSF], the Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA], the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation [FDIC], the Resolution Trust Corporation [RTC], and the new Corporation for National and Community Service, which was established earlier this year. These various agencies support everything from community and neighborhood development to programs for the homeless, to disaster assistance, to pollution control, to medical care and treatment for veterans and their eligible beneficiaries.

The major EPA programs which are funded by this bill include pollution abatement, control, and compliance; wastewater treatment facilities; and oilspill prevention and response activities. The EPA also subsidizes the costs of

loans made to needy local education agencies to remove hazardous asbestos in school buildings. It additionally operates the hazardous substance Superfund Program, which was established to clean up emergency hazardous materials and spills and dangerous, uncontrolled, and abandoned hazardous waste sites.

This bill also funds FEMA, the agency that is charged with coordinating the entire Federal disaster assistance response by providing support and relief to public entities, individuals, and families. This includes protective measures, debris clearance, the repair and restoration of damaged facilities, and temporary housing.

The funds provided in this bill enable the VA to administer benefits for veterans, family members of living veterans, and survivors of deceased veterans—28.7 percent of our total population. These benefits include pension payments; disability compensation payments; educational training and vocational assistance; guaranteed loans for housing assistance; life insurance policies; and inpatient care and treatment in hospitals, nursing homes, and clinics. The bill also provides for the major construction, modernization, alteration, and improvement of VA facilities, and supplies matching grants to assist States in the construction and establishment of State veterans' homes and nursing care facilities.

Through HUD, the bill funds programs that support our housing needs and the development and preservation of our communities. These include mortgage insurance programs that help families become homeowners and facilitate the construction and rehabilitation of rental units; rental assistance programs for lower income families who otherwise could not afford decent housing; programs that aid community and neighborhood development and preservation; and programs that help protect the home buyer in the marketplace.

One of HUD's most effective programs is the Community Development Block Grant, or CDBG, Program, which supports grants to State and local governments for local community development initiatives, such as decent, affordable housing, suitable living environments, and expansion of economic opportunity. These CDBG funds are often the only sources of revenue for new or previously unfunded public services, particularly in rural areas. These funds also generate local employment opportunities.

For example, CDBG loans to small businesses enable them to hire local workers, both temporarily and permanently. Colusa County, in my district, has participated in the CDBG Program for over 10 years now, and uses much of its CDBG funds for economic development. Its revolving loan fund for small businesses has enabled many of them to stay afloat and support the surrounding area. In Yolo County, CDBG funds are used primarily for housing rehabilitation; over 100 units have been rehabilitated since 1987. However, the county also lent CDBG economic development funds to a small firm for job creation. The firm has since then totally repaid the loan, and the county can now recycle the funds into a revolving loan fund for job generation in other small businesses.

This bill also provides funding for the new Corporation for National and Community Service, the President's National Service Program.

National Service will enable participants to work in programs that address unmet human, educational, environmental, and public safety needs. It will involve the most diverse range of Americans, from high school students to our oldest citizens, and will serve populations as diverse. And in exchange for their service, participants will receive financial assistance for their education.

These service programs will be defined and driven by the needs of States and local communities. Program participants will teach, tutor, and care for small children; run recycling programs; aid homebound individuals; provide home care for senior citizens; and clean up our parks and playgrounds. Communities will be served through Head Start centers, family support programs, community health centers, police departments, schools, conservation organizations, and in many other ways that work to meet the needs of that community in that community.

The conferees have set funding priorities for the wide variety of agencies and programs that this bill supports. Yet the total funding level in the bill that they have produced is within the subcommittee's funding target and below the President's budget request.

The conferees have managed to achieve a balance—between meeting the needs of the many Americans who depend on the programs and services that this bill funds and being fiscally responsible. This conference report will ensure that millions of Americans have access to decent housing and neighborhoods, quality medical care, and a clean environment. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support its passage.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 341, nays 89 not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 513]

YEAS—341

Abercrombie	Becerra	Boucher	Carr
Ackerman	Bentley	Brewster	Castle
Andrews (ME)	Bereuter	Brooks	Chapman
Andrews (NJ)	Berman	Browder	Clay
Andrews (TX)	Bevill	Brown (CA)	Clayton
Applegate	Billbray	Brown (FL)	Clement
Bacchus (FL)	Billirakis	Brown (OH)	Clinger
Baessler	Bishop	Bryant	Clyburn
Baker (CA)	Blackwell	Buyer	Coleman
Barca	Bliley	Calvert	Collins (IL)
Barcia	Boehlert	Camp	Collins (MI)
Barlow	Bonilla	Canady	Conyers
Barrett (WI)	Bonior	Cantwell	Cooper
Bateman	Borski	Cardin	Costello
			Coyne
			Cramer
			Cunningham
			Danner
			Darden
			de la Garza
			Deal
			DeFazio
			DeLauro
			DeLay
			Dellums
			Derrick
			Deutsch
			Diaz-Balart
			Dicks
			Dingell
			Dixon
			Dooley
			Dunn
			Durbin
			Edwards (CA)
			Edwards (TX)
			Emerson
			English (AZ)
			English (OK)
			Eshoo
			Evans
			Ewing
			Farr
			Fazio
			Fields (LA)
			Filner
			Fingerhut
			Fish
			Flake
			Foglietta
			Ford (MI)
			Fowler
			Frank (MA)
			Franks (CT)
			Frost
			Furse
			Gallely
			Gallo
			Gejdenson
			Gephardt
			Geren
			Gibbons
			Gilchrest
			Gillmor
			Gilman
			Gingrich
			Glickman
			Gonzalez
			Goodling
			Gordon
			Grandy
			Green
			Greenwood
			Gunderson
			Gutierrez
			Hall (OH)
			Hall (TX)
			Hamburg
			Hamilton
			Hansen
			Harman
			Hastert
			Hastings
			Hayes
			Hefner
			Herger
			Hilliard
			Hinchey
			Hobson
			Hochbrueckner
			Hoke
			Horn
			Houghton
			Hoyer
			Hughes
			Hutto
			Hyde
			Inlee
			Istook
			Jefferson
			Johnson (CT)
			Johnson (GA)
			Johnson (SD)
			Johnson, E. B.
			Johnston
			Kanjorski
			Kaptur
			Kasich
			Kennedy
			Kennelly
			Kildee
			Kim
			King
			Kingston
			Klecska
			Klein
			Klink
			Kopetski
			Kreidler
			Kyl
			LaFalce
			Lambert
			Lancaster
			Lantos
			LaRocco
			Laughlin
			Lazio
			Lehman
			Levin
			Levy
			Lewis (CA)
			Lewis (GA)
			Lightfoot
			Linder
			Lipinski
			Livingston
			Lloyd
			Long
			Lowe
			Machtley
			Maloney
			Mann
			Manton
			Markey
			Martinez
			Mataul
			Mazzoli
			McCandless
			McCloskey
			McCollum
			McCrery
			McCurdy
			McDade
			McDermott
			McHale
			McHugh
			McKeon
			McKinney
			McMillan
			McNulty
			Meehan
			Meek
			Menendez
			Meyers
			Mfume
			Michel
			Miller (CA)
			Mineta
			Mink
			Moakley
			Mollinari
			Mollohan
			Montgomery
			Moran
			Morella
			Murphy
			Murtha
			Myers
			Nadler
			Natcher
			Neal (MA)
			Neal (NC)
			Oberstar
			Obey
			Oliver
			Ortiz
			Owens
			Oxley
			Packard
			Parker
			Pastor
			Payne (NJ)
			Payne (VA)
			Peterson (FL)
			Pickett
			Pickle
			Pomeroy
			Porter
			Poshard
			Price (NC)
			Przyce (OH)
			Quillen
			Quinn
			Rahall
			Rangel
			Ravenel
			Reed
			Regula
			Reynolds
			Richardson
			Ridge
			Rogers
			Ros-Lehtinen
			Rose
			Rostenkowski
			Rowland
			Roybal-Allard
			Rush
			Sabo
			Sanders
			Sangmeister
			Santorum
			Sarpalius
			Sawyer
			Schick
			Schroeder
			Schumer
			Scott
			Serrano
			Sharp
			Shaw
			Shays
			Shepherd
			Sisisky
			Skaggs
			Skeen
			Skelton
			Slattery
			Slaughter
			Smith (IA)
			Smith (NJ)
			Smith (TX)
			Snowe
			Spratt
			Stark
			Stearns
			Stenholm
			Stokes
			Strickland
			Studds
			Stupak
			Sundquist
			Swift
			Synar
			Talent
			Tanner
			Tauzin
			Taylor (MS)
			Taylor (NC)
			Tejeda
			Thomas (CA)
			Thomas (WY)
			Thompson
			Thornton
			Thurman
			Torres
			Torricelli
			Towns
			Traficant
			Tucker
			Unsold
			Upton
			Valentine
			Velazquez
			Vento
			Visclosky
			Volkmer
			Vucanovich
			Walsh
			Washington
			Watters
			Watt
			Waxman
			Weldon
			Wheat

NAYS—89

Allard	Fawell	Minge
Archer	Fields (TX)	Moorhead
Armey	Franks (NJ)	Nussle
Bachus (AL)	Gekas	Orton
Baker (LA)	Goodlatte	Pallone
Ballenger	Goss	Paxon
Barrett (NE)	Grams	Penny
Bartlett	Hancock	Peterson (MN)
Barton	Hefley	Petri
Beilenson	Hoagland	Pombo
Blute	Hoekstra	Portman
Boehner	Holden	Ramstad
Bunning	Huffington	Roberts
Burton	Hunter	Roemer
Byrne	Hutchinson	Rohrabacher
Callahan	Inglis	Roth
Coble	Inhofe	Roukema
Collins (GA)	Jacobs	Royce
Combest	Johnson, Sam	Schaefer
Condit	Klug	Sensenbrenner
Coppersmith	Knollenberg	Shuster
Cox	Kolbe	Smith (MI)
Crane	Leach	Smith (OR)
Crapo	Lewis (FL)	Solomon
Dickey	Manzullo	Spence
Doilittle	Margolies-	Stump
Dornan	Mezvinisky	Torkildsen
Dreier	McInnis	Walker
Duncan	Mica	Zeliff
Everett	Miller (FL)	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—3

Engel Ford (TN) Pelosi

□ 1556

Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY and Messrs. HEFLEY, BAKER of Louisiana, GOODLATTE, and MINGE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. RAVENEL, McHUGH, and KYL and Mrs. SCHROEDER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to House Resolution 275, the amendments in disagreement and the motions printed in the joint statement are considered as read.

The Clerk will designate the first amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 18, line 17, after "1994" insert "; and up to \$203,000,000 of amounts of budget authority for rental assistance under section 8 of the Act and section 162(h) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987 recaptured during fiscal year 1992 as a result of the conversion of section 202 direct loans to capital grants".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 38: Page 24, strike out lines 20 to 23, and insert:

For the urban revitalization demonstration program under the third paragraph under the head "Homeownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere grants (HOPE grants)" in the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993, Public Law 102-389, 106 Stat. 1571, 1579, \$803,240,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the first proviso of such third paragraph, the Secretary shall have discretion to approve funding for more than fifteen applicants: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing amount that is used for the urban revitalization demonstration program shall be made available for an application that was not submitted to the Secretary by May 26, 1993: *Provided further*, That of the foregoing \$803,240,000, the Secretary may use up to \$2,500,000 for technical assistance under such urban revitalization demonstration, to be made available directly, or indirectly under contracts or grants, as appropriate: *Provided further*, That nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit the Secretary from conforming the program standards and criteria set forth herein, with subsequent authorization legislation that may be enacted into law: *Provided further*, That of the \$803,240,000 made available under this heading, \$20,000,000 shall be made to eligible grantees under the urban revitalization demonstration program, to implement programs authorized under subtitle D of title IV, and of which, \$10,000,000 shall be made for youth apprenticeship training activities for joint labor-management organizations pursuant to section 3(c)(2)(B) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, as amended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

For the urban revitalization demonstration program under the third paragraph under the head "Homeownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere grants (HOPE grants)" in the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993, Public Law 102-389, 106 Stat. 1571, 1579, \$778,240,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the first proviso in such third paragraph, the Secretary shall have discretion to approve funding for more than fifteen applicants: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing amount that is used for the urban revitalization demonstration program shall be made available for an application that was not submitted to the Secretary by May 26, 1993: *Provided further*, That of the foregoing \$778,240,000, the Secretary may use up to \$2,500,000 for technical assistance under such urban revitalization demonstration, to be

made available directly, or indirectly, under contracts or grants, as appropriate: *Provided further*, That nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit the Secretary from conforming the program's standards and criteria set forth herein, with subsequent authorization legislation that may be enacted into law: *Provided further*, That of the \$778,240,000 made available under this heading, \$20,000,000 shall be made to eligible grantees under the urban revitalization demonstration program, to implement programs authorized under subtitle D of title IV, and of which, \$10,000,000 shall be made for youth apprenticeship training activities for joint labor-management organizations pursuant to section 3(c)(2)(B) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, as amended.

INNOVATIVE HOMELESS INITIATIVES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

For the innovative homeless initiatives demonstration program as authorized by section 2 of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993, \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CAPACITY BUILDING FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING

For the capacity building for community development and affordable housing program as authorized by section 4 of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993, \$20,000,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 57: Page 34, line 9, strike out "(b)(2)" and insert "(b)".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 113: Page 52, line 21, after "activities" insert: *Provided further*, That, pursuant to Public Law 102-486, an amount equal to not more than 50 percent of all utility energy efficiency and water conservation cash rebates received by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration may be made available for additional energy efficiency and water conservation measures, including facility surveys".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of

the Senate numbered 113, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert *Provided further*, That, pursuant to Public Law 102-486, an amount equal to not more than 50 percent of all utility energy efficiency and water conservation cash rebates received by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration may be made available for additional energy efficiency and water conservation measures, including facility surveys".

Provided further, That none of the funds provided in this Act to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for other than termination costs of the advanced solid rocket motor program."

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amounts appropriated in this Act for fiscal year 1994 shall be: \$4,853,500,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration "Space flight, control and data communications", \$517,700,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration "Construction of facilities", \$7,529,300,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration "Research and development", \$1,480,853,000 for the Environmental Protection Agency "Hazardous substance superfund", \$1,998,500,000 for the National Science Foundation "Research and related activities", and \$110,000,000 for the National Science Foundation "Academic research infrastructure".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 275, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Is the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] opposed to the motion?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

□ 1600

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendment to terminate the advanced solid rocket motor.

The fact is that we have a \$1 billion state-of-the-art facility, owned by NASA, in Mississippi. It is 90 percent complete. The earlier conference agreement killed funding for the program unless a stringent set of circumstances is met, but did allow for completion of the facility. The gentleman from Wisconsin mentioned the \$1 billion in the facility owned by NASA.

By doing so, we would be taking the most cost-effective approach in the long-run because it would provide NASA with the flexibility it needs to meet the challenges of manned space flight in the future. If the decision is made to go to a significantly higher orbit in future flights, we will need the ASRM, as attested to by NASA administrator Dan Goldin. And we would

need the capabilities offered at the Yellow Creek site in Mississippi.

Knocking out all funding and stopping completion of the work at Yellow Creek would greatly limit NASA's ability to respond to changes in the space program in the future. It also would preclude NASA from exploring other options at this modern, government-owned facility.

With this action, we are jeopardizing a solid and substantial investment in money, as well as putting severe limits on NASA's ability to plan for the future. I ask my colleagues to consider these points and to oppose the amendment to terminate ASRM.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would like now to offer an amendment restoring the June House position on ASRM.

This amendment provides that no funds, except for termination costs, may be used for the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor Program.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, to be sure that there is no doubt about the issue, the amendment will transfer \$57,500,000 from the NASA space flight, control and data communications account and the NASA construction of facilities account to the following accounts and programs: \$20 million for NASA's national aerospace plane—NASP, in the research and development account; \$12,500,000 to support scientists in a variety of strategic research endeavors as part of the research and related activities of the National Science Foundation; \$10 million for the construction and procurement of research facilities and instruments within the National Science Foundation's infrastructure account; and \$15 million for EPA's Hazardous Substance Superfund. I urge the Administrator to use some of these funds for an emerging area in environmental cleanup—the restoration of contaminated lands—brownfields—in urban areas to productive use.

Mr. Speaker, these activities will promote investments in high technology, scientific research, and environmental cleanup, and will restore the NASA ASRM funding to the level carried in the bill as it left the House last June.

This action will leave \$100,000,000 in the NASA space flight account for termination costs only.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOKES. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] for this amendment and urge my colleagues in the House to support it.

As one who has been a principal opponent of continued funding for the ASRM, let me say that I believe that

the Stokes motion does what those of us that have wanted to defund the ASRM will do. That is, to provide money for termination costs only.

I do wish to advise the Chair that I intend to ask for a rollover vote on adoption of the Stokes motion so that perhaps those in the other body will get the message that the time has come to terminate the ASRM. I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Ohio is overwhelmingly supported.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] and echo what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], my colleague from Wisconsin, said just a minute ago, which is that I and most of the folks originally opposed to the ASRM fully endorse this amendment today to terminate the program and to essentially only spend the money we are obligated to spend to terminate the program as it now exists.

There is really no reason to beat up on ASRM any longer, but I think it is clear to a number of us who fought this issue over the last several years that the project has been wildly over budget and that it is a program now essentially designed and fully funded without a mission.

In fact, the most recent testimony indicates that the ASRM will finally be ready to go at about the same time the space shuttle missions are coming to an end.

This is a vote today that will save us, over the long run, about \$2.6 billion in funding for the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor Program. I and a number of my colleagues, given the choice in the best of all worlds, would like to see the money banked and used to reduce the deficit. That is not an option, unfortunately, under the rules of the House.

I think it is still appropriate, however, that all of us who fought against ASRM so hard in the past today support the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and terminate the program and finally at least put one notch on our belts for eliminating a wasteful, inefficient, and overbloaded Government program.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] for yielding me this time. I want to rise in strong support of his motion with regard to the ASRM. I think that that is the best that can be done under the circumstances, and it comes close to the

proposal that originally we had endorsed in the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for a brief colloquy relative to amendment 101 of the conference report.

The statement of managers explaining amendment 101 indicates that, in addition to placing a calendar date limitation on the availability of about half of the funds for the space station, that a cap will be in effect for the remainder of the funds. Further, the statement of managers indicates that a procedure has been agreed to governing the release of the remainder of that money.

While I recognize the expediency of the arrangement that the parties to this agreement were seeking to achieve, I want to state my strong belief that the issue of how the United States structures a cooperative arrangement with Russia on the space station will have far reaching effects—not only on space policy but also on foreign policy. This is a manner on which the entire House should have a say.

I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman three relevant questions about the procedure for the release of the money that is capped.

First, can the gentleman explain for the Members precisely what this procedure will be?

Second, can the gentleman explain how this agreement was reached?

Third, can the gentleman state precisely what criteria he will use to judge the acceptability of the administration's proposal for the space station in order to release the remainder of the appropriated funds?

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman's questions, let me say first that I cannot give the precise details on what procedure we would use.

But I can give him some idea of our thoughts at this time.

As I think the gentleman may be aware, both he and I and Mr. WALKER and Mr. LEWIS have expressed serious reservations concerning the so-called Russian option for the United States space station. We put those reservations in a letter to the Vice President.

□ 1610

Following that Senator MIKULSKI and I met with the Vice President and his National Security staff to discuss what options we could pursue to ensure that the House and the Senate had an opportunity to take a closer look at the effects of any further agreements reached between the United States and Russia concerning our space station.

I want the gentleman to know that I felt strongly that the Appropriations Committee had a special responsibility to the House in this case. I felt we should not simply appropriate \$2.1 billion without having some idea about what space station we are buying.

I also think that if the gentleman looks at the language in the statement of the managers—he will see that concern expressed again—including the fact that we are spending \$8 million a day on a space station that is, more or less, in limbo awaiting a decision on Russian participation.

Let me say further to the gentleman that my first choice in dealing with this issue was to have a second vote in the House either this fall or next spring.

In the first case, the Appropriations Committee would have meted out about \$500 million and looked for a second vote at roughly the end of November. At that time, after consulting with the gentleman's committee, we would have determined whether we wanted to release the balance of the \$1.6 billion for space station, dependent on what final arrangements had been reached with Russia.

In the second case, we would have meted out \$1.1 billion and taken a second vote some time next March.

I think it is fair to suggest that the administration strongly urged that we not take station up for a second vote either this fall or next spring. To be fair, I believe they are fully aware of our concerns and will actively try to ensure that those concerns are carefully considered in any discussions with the Russian Government.

So the compromise that we came up with makes use of a longstanding arrangement with NASA which permits the Committees on Appropriations to cap programs and subsequently release money, providing that the use of the money meets the satisfaction of the committee and of other Members of the House.

While I would agree with the gentleman from California that this procedure is certainly not the best available and was not the preferred procedure—I think it is only fair to point out that since the responsibility for appropriating the money in the first place rests with the Appropriations Committee—it seems reasonable that we should have some control and responsibility for how it is spent.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the gentleman that as we see events unfold over the coming month or two concerning what impact the Russian option will have on our space station, we will fully involve both the gentleman from California, [Mr. BROWN] and other members of his committee including, of course, the minority.

And, finally, Mr. Speaker, in terms of what criteria we would use to judge the

acceptability of the administration's proposal for space station in order to release the remainder of the appropriated funds, I think it would be fair to suggest that the basis of that criteria will be the concerns expressed in the joint letter that we sent to the Vice President on September 21.

At the core of those concerns is our view that whatever Russian contributions are agreed upon for station, and I believe the gentleman from California shares that view, that that contribution be enhancing rather than enabling.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my response is satisfactory, and we will discuss these issues more in the coming weeks.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state my belief that the distinguished gentleman and I are in full agreement on the substance of this issue, and I look forward to continuing the consultative relationship we have had at the time that the administration submits a request to release the remainder of the appropriated funding next year.

However, I would also like to make the point that this procedure by which funds appropriated by Congress are further withheld, controlled, or directed by nonlegislative correspondence would be unconstitutional if it were included in the legislation itself. Furthermore, it denies the whole House a fundamental right. As my colleagues may know, I am firmly opposed to actions taken in report language that would be illegal or contradict the rules of the House if it were bill language. I hope that my colleagues will join me in taking a serious look at this issue in the future.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the House has spoken very clearly on the issue of the ASRM. I think it should be said for the RECORD, however, that it was the intent of the subcommittee to move in the direction of closing down ASRM. We simply felt early on that there was a need to keep at least a crack open in case we do formulate an agreement with the Russians that leads to the requirement for a booster that will enable us to fulfill that agreement with the Russians.

The House has given very clear directions to us at this moment. Should we find ourselves in the circumstance, however, that we have an agreement somewhere down the line with the Russians, we may have to revisit the subject. The House should be on notice of that fact.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would rise in support of the motion of

the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], and commend both the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] for their cooperation on this issue.

I would also like to say that as somebody who has been fighting ASRM, the advanced solid rocket motor, since the committee offering an amendment to kill this, there have been so many Members of the body that have worked hard in doing this. The gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. SHEPHERD], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG], and a host of people are trying to do what is in the merits of good science and what is going to be in the taxpayers' interests as well, too.

Without going too much into the copious history of this particular project, I will reiterate that this particular project was 100 percent, or was going to be 100 percent, over budget. It was not going to be completed until its mission of putting a space station up was already done, so we would have this done in the year 2001, and the space station, if we continued to fund that, would need to be up way before that. I think just on the merits of this project, this was not one that was in the best interests of science.

Second, an issue of the integrity of the House was at stake. We had spoken very strongly on this issue, not once but twice. We hope it will not need a third or fourth or fifth time to kill this.

Third, the budget deficit is a very important issue in consideration of this project. We complain that it will take \$100 million to close down and terminate this project, but on the side, we would have spent \$3 billion to complete this project that would not have been in the best interests of the NASA budget.

Finally, in conclusion, I would just like to say that we have put nails in the coffin of ASRM before. We were hoping that the rule that we passed with 305 votes was going to be a stake in the heart, and we hope now the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will be a silver bullet to kill this particular project.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. Speaker, I am in full support of H.R. 2591, the funding bill for the veterans affairs and housing and urban development agencies.

The funding provided in this bill is critical to families across America, and we need to assure that this most necessary funding gets out to those who need it.

There are many veterans in my district who rely on health services from their VA hospital. The programs funded through this bill are essential to them, and we need to assure them

that the programs they have come to rely upon will be there when they need it.

I am grateful to Chairman STOKES for crafting this legislation. I appreciate his leadership on the issues of veterans affairs, housing, and space science.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment that terminates the advanced solid rocket motor. While a great deal of misinformation has been provided by opponents, these facts remain:

Following the *Challenger* tragedy, the Presidential commission which studied the accident called for the creation of the ASRM program to provide for greater safety, reliability, boost capability and management control for our manned-space effort. Thus the competition for a government owned, contractor operated facility went forward. Yellow Creek, MI, was chosen because its preexisting infrastructure saved time and money in the construction process and it had the best transportation system.

Today, \$1.9 billion has been invested in the program and the facilities that would build a motor providing for at least an additional 12,000 pounds of payload are 90 percent complete. This would allow NASA to meet international commitments of a space station design to go to 51.6 degrees or more. NASA Administrator Dan Goldin has said that in order to get to the higher inclination, which was endorsed by the space station *Freedom* redesign panel, "We have got to have the ASRM."

Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal invested in this program not only in money, but also in the dreams of our manned space program. We must not waste this solid investment and I urge defeat of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out these facts in earlier consideration of this issue and we are meeting with other Members to see what can be done to best use this asset if the amendment is accepted.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is, will the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 113 and concur with an amendment?

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 30, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 514]

YEAS—401

Abercrombie	Andrews (TX)	Baker (CA)
Ackerman	Applegate	Baker (LA)
Allard	Archer	Ballenger
Andrews (ME)	Armey	Barca
Andrews (NJ)	Baessler	Barcia

Barlow	Filner	Laughlin	Roberts	Sisisky	Thurman
Barrett (NE)	Fingerhut	Lazio	Roemer	Skaggs	Torkildsen
Barrett (WI)	Fish	Leach	Rogers	Skeen	Torres
Bartlett	Flake	Lehman	Rohrabacher	Skelton	Towns
Barton	Foglietta	Levin	Ros-Lehtinen	Slattery	Tucker
Bateman	Ford (MI)	Levy	Rose	Slaughter	Unsoeld
Becerra	Fowler	Lewis (CA)	Rostenkowski	Smith (IA)	Upton
Beilenson	Frank (MA)	Lewis (FL)	Roth	Smith (MI)	Valentine
Bentley	Franks (CT)	Lewis (GA)	Roukema	Smith (NJ)	Velazquez
Bereuter	Franks (NJ)	Linder	Rowland	Smith (OR)	Vento
Berman	Frost	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard	Smith (TX)	Visclosky
Bilbray	Furse	Lloyd	Royce	Snowe	Volkmer
Bilirakis	Gallely	Long	Rush	Solomon	Vucanovich
Bishop	Gallo	Lowey	Sabo	Spence	Walker
Blackwell	Gejdenson	Machtley	Sanders	Spratt	Walsh
Bliley	Gephardt	Maloney	Sangmeister	Stark	Washington
Blute	Gibbons	Mann	Santorum	Stearns	Waters
Boehert	Gilchrest	Manton	Sarpaluis	Stenholm	Watt
Boehner	Gillmor	Manzullo	Sawyer	Stokes	Waxman
Bonilla	Gilman	Margolies-	Saxton	Strickland	Weldon
Bonior	Gingrich	Mezvinsky	Schaefer	Studds	Wheat
Borski	Glickman	Markey	Schenk	Stump	Williams
Boucher	Gonzalez	Martinez	Schiff	Stupak	Wilson
Brewster	Goodlatte	Matsui	Schroeder	Swett	Wise
Brooks	Goodling	Mazzoli	Schumer	Swift	Wolf
Brown (CA)	Gordon	McCandless	Scott	Synar	Woolsey
Brown (FL)	Goss	McCollum	Sensenbrenner	Talent	Wyden
Brown (OH)	Grams	McCrery	Serrano	Tauzin	Wynn
Bryant	Grandy	McCurdy	Sharp	Taylor (NC)	Yates
Bunning	Green	McDade	Shaw	Tejeda	Young (AK)
Burton	Greenwood	McDermott	Shays	Thomas (CA)	Young (FL)
Buyer	Gunderson	McHale	Shepherd	Thomas (WY)	Zeliff
Byrne	Gutierrez	McHugh	Shuster	Thornton	Zimmer
Calvert	Hall (OH)	McInnis			
Camp	Hamburg	McKeon			
Canady	Hamilton	McKinney	Bacchus (FL)	Hall (TX)	Pickett
Cantwell	Hancock	McMillan	Bacchus (AL)	Hochbrueckner	Pickle
Cardin	Hansen	McNulty	Bevill	Lightfoot	Quillen
Carr	Harman	Meehan	Browder	Livingston	Sundquist
Castle	Hastert	Meek	Callahan	McCloskey	Tanner
Chapman	Hastings	Menendez	Cramer	Mica	Taylor (MS)
Clay	Hayes	Meyers	Derrick	Mineta	Thompson
Clayton	Hefley	Mfume	Everett	Montgomery	Torricelli
Clement	Hefner	Michel	Gekas	Murtha	Trafficant
Clinger	Herger	Miller (CA)	Geren	Parker	Whitten
Clyburn	Hilliard	Miller (FL)			
Coble	Hinchey	Minge			
Coleman	Hoagland	Mink	Engel	Ford (TN)	
Collins (GA)	Hobson	Moakley			
Collins (IL)	Hoekstra	Molinar			
Collins (MI)	Hoke	Mollohan			
Combest	Holden	Moorhead			
Condit	Horn	Moran			
Conyers	Houghton	Morella			
Cooper	Hoyer	Murphy			
Coppersmith	Huffington	Myers			
Costello	Hughes	Nadler			
Cox	Hunter	Natcher			
Coyne	Hutchinson	Neal (MA)			
Crane	Hutto	Neal (NC)			
Crapo	Hyde	Nussle			
Cunningham	Inglis	Oberstar			
Danner	Inhofe	Obey			
Darden	Inslee	Olver			
de la Garza	Istook	Ortiz			
Deal	Jacobs	Orton			
DeFazio	Jefferson	Owens			
DeLauro	Johnson (CT)	Oxley			
DeLay	Johnson (GA)	Packard			
Dellums	Johnson (SD)	Pallone			
Deutsch	Johnson E. B.	Pastor			
Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam	Paxon			
Dickey	Johnston	Payne (NJ)			
Dicks	Kanjorski	Payne (VA)			
Dingell	Kaptur	Pelosi			
Dixon	Kasich	Penny			
Dooley	Kennedy	Peterson (FL)			
Doolittle	Kennelly	Peterson (MN)			
Dornan	Kildee	Petri			
Dreier	Kim	Pombo			
Duncan	King	Pomeroy			
Dunn	Kingston	Porter			
Durbin	Kleczka	Portman			
Edwards (CA)	Klein	Poshard			
Edwards (TX)	Klink	Price (NC)			
Emerson	Klug	Pryce (OH)			
English (AZ)	Knollenberg	Quinn			
English (OK)	Kolbe	Rahall			
Eshoo	Kopetski	Ramstad			
Evans	Kreidler	Rangel			
Ewing	Kyl	Ravenel			
Farr	LaFalce	Reed			
Fawell	Lambert	Regula			
Fazio	Lancaster	Reynolds			
Fields (LA)	Lantos	Richardson			
Fields (TX)	LaRocco	Ridge			

NAYS—30

Bacchus (FL)	Hall (TX)	Pickett
Bacchus (AL)	Hochbrueckner	Pickle
Bevill	Lightfoot	Quillen
Browder	Livingston	Sundquist
Callahan	McCloskey	Tanner
Cramer	Mica	Taylor (MS)
Derrick	Mineta	Thompson
Everett	Montgomery	Torricelli
Gekas	Murtha	Trafficant
Geren	Parker	Whitten

NOT VOTING—2

Engel Ford (TN)

□ 1639

Messrs. PICKETT, HOCHBRUECKNER, GEKAS, DERRICK, and TANNER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. ZIMMER, KNOLLENBERG, and WELDON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the House receded from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 113 and concurred with an amendment.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 129: Page 58, line 16, strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert: "\$25,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR.

SOLOMON

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SOLOMON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129 and concur therein.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of determining the appropriate allocation of time for debate on my motion, I would, after consultation with the committee chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], ask unanimous consent that the 1 hour of debate time be equally divided between the two of them and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] on that side and myself on this side, each with 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Accordingly, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will be recognized for 15 minutes; the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] will be recognized for 15 minutes; the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have some good news for Members. If we pass the Solomon-Montgomery motion to save the Selective Service System, this good conference report, and it is a good bill, bypasses the Senate. It goes directly to the President for his signature and it helps guarantee that we are going to adjourn before Thanksgiving. So let us all support the Solomon-Montgomery motion.

Mr. Speaker, the opponents of Selective Service claim that the mission of the agency is no longer necessary because the cold war is over, but the ability to mobilize and draft people quickly is not entirely about the cold war.

The United States needed to draft people during the Korean war.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] be able to go home for Thanksgiving, regardless of how the vote turns out.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, back to serious business. The United States needed to draft people during the Korean war and the Vietnam war, and those were not wars with the former Soviet Union. Most recently, events in Russia, in Somalia, in Bosnia and other flashpoints around the world showed the wisdom of staying prepared for unpredictable emergencies.

Mr. Speaker, God forbid if nuclear controls in Russia or one of the former

Soviet Republics ever fall into the wrong hands. The strategic situation in Europe and across the Atlantic would be transformed in a split second; we all know that.

What if the worst were to happen in Korea, another unstable region of the world, and we did not have the backup to reinforce our active duty troops? North Korea is only 1 year away at most from having a nuclear weapon. It already has the missile capability of hitting South Korea and hitting Japan.

Mr. Speaker, the top military people in this country believe we must maintain the capability to mobilize quickly, especially at a time of dramatic reductions in the size of our active-duty military forces.

We heard a dramatic speech on this floor by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] about this very subject the other day.

Senator SAM NUNN believes it would be a serious mistake to terminate the Selective Service System, and he said so during the debate in the other body.

But listen to who else is opposed to abolishing Selective Service. Senator JOHN GLENN, Senators BARBARA MIKULSKI, TOM DASCHLE, SIMON, and DODD, Senator BYRD, and a majority of the Senate agree with Senator SAM NUNN.

Since the vote in the House, each of the Armed Services chiefs has come out in strong support of retaining Selective Service.

I would also point out that Gen. Colin Powell, as recently as the other day when many of us had lunch with him, stated that the earlier House vote was a serious mistake. Here is what General Powell said about Selective Service:

America needs to keep the option of rapidly reconstituting its forces, and I urge that we maintain the Selective Service System.

Even more importantly, Mr. Speaker, ever since draft registration was reinstated, millions of young Americans have lived up to their obligations as U.S. citizens. They have obeyed the law of the land and they have registered for the draft. Ninety-seven percent of them have obeyed that law, while the other 3 percent got off scot free. To now say we are going to pardon them, and that is exactly what we are doing if we abolish this agency, to say we are going to pardon them and make them eligible for all Federal benefits and all the grants is a slap in the face to every patriotic American, particularly those who went to serve in the Armed Services.

I do not have to tell you about this list of 19 veterans' organizations who feel very strongly about this.

Mr. Speaker, let me just give one last reason. In my State of New York and in the State of California and a number of other States, military recruiters for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force are not allowed on high school campuses. They are not allowed to come there and offer young men, 17 and

18 years of age, and young women, too, an honorable career in our military. They are prohibited from going on campus. Many times the only place we can make these names available to the recruiters is from Selective Service lists. That is one of the reasons why we desperately need to maintain the Selective Service System; otherwise we are going to go back to 1979 when all we were attracting into the military were people who were just looking for jobs. They were desperate. We were not getting a cross-section of America.

We need to maintain an all-volunteer military to deal with these critical issues that will be coming before our country. One of the ways we can do that is simply by restoring 80 percent of the recommended funding for the Selective Service System, \$25 million. This is an amount which has not gone up in over 10 years. They have been tightening their belts for 10 years. They will continue to do so, but let us stay prepared.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the Solomon-Montgomery amendment when it comes to a vote in a few minutes.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from New York to recede and concur to the Senate amendment that restores funding for the Selective Service System.

I urge Members to vote down the motion of the gentleman from New York. After it is defeated, I will offer a motion to insist on the House position to appropriate \$5 million to terminate the Selective Service System.

On June 29, the House voted to terminate funding for Selective Service. On October 1, during the VA-HUD conference, the Senate declined to agree to the House position. My counterpart, Senator MIKULSKI, and I could not compromise because there is no middle ground on this issue—Selective Service is either necessary or it is not. For that reason, the Senator and I agreed to bring the issue back to both Houses, and follow the will of the Congress.

I ask you today to reaffirm the House position and vote to terminate Selective Service. I urge this for three reasons:

First, Selective Service is not a military necessity;

Second, it harms inner-city youth; and

Third, and it takes money away from important programs.

Selective Service is not a military necessity because the volunteer army has succeeded in dealing with every crisis for 20 years, including Desert Storm. DOD planning projections show no need for a draft unless Russia rebuilds as a superpower. If a military need were to arise, Selective Service would be superfluous because the military has insufficient training facilities for inductees.

Selective Service harms inner-city youth because young men failing to register cannot receive student loans or Government jobs. Selective Service has proven incapable of reaching these youths and encouraging them to register. Once they have not registered, they can never obtain student loans, or Federal jobs, or often State student loans, or jobs in State governments.

Selective Service takes money away from other high priority programs. Funding for Selective Service can be used to help veterans, aid the homeless, produce affordable housing, protect the environment, and support scientific research. The need for money to address problems in these areas is unquestioned, yet the Congress is often forced to reduce these expenditures because of the need to reduce the deficit. If deficit reduction is going to be accomplished, it should begin here.

If we ever again need general conscription, we should follow the examples of World War II and the cold war. The United States initiated registration in 1940, a year before the World War II draft became necessary. After World War II, the United States disbanded Selective Service, reconstituted it in 1948 as the dangers of the cold war became manifest. If a global challenge were to arise again that would require conscription, we could do as we did in the past, and simply reconstitute Selective Service. In the meantime, while we have no need, we should take resources from Selective Service and apply them to worthy and necessary programs or to reduce the deficit.

I urge Members to vote down the motion of the gentleman from New York.

□ 1650

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great reservation that I rise to speak on this matter at all. As a matter of fact, I think the House is perfectly capable of quickly working its will on this matter. Nonetheless, my chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], has indicated rather clearly that, if Selective Service once again is a need of the country, we can recreate that system. The people have demonstrated more than once that they are extremely responsive in times of crisis. In the meantime, there is approximately \$25 million a year, moneys that are expended year in and year out, where the need is in question.

Because of my reservations about this yearly spending for the sake of local bureaucracies, I recommend the House terminate the Selective Service.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES]

a perfect gentleman. He has yielded us 15 minutes of his 30 minutes of time because he knows of our interest in this important matter, and I certainly rise, in strong support, to accept the Senate amendment that was made by the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON]. I strongly believe it is in the national security interest to continue funding for the Selective Service System.

As my colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, the selective service has always been there to provide an inexpensive insurance policy in the event of major crises. I am not sure that really this is a proper way to eliminate a Government agency, by cutting off the money without other committees having some input, especially on an issue that affects the military security of this country. If we kill selective service today, I do not care what my colleagues say. It would take a year or longer to implement or call up a national emergency. That might be too late.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe that if the Persian Gulf war had lasted another 6 months and we had suffered a large number of casualties, volunteers for the services would have fallen off, and the draft would have had to have been implemented. Thank God this did not happen. I totally support the all volunteer system, but at certain times we may again need the draft and need it quickly.

Can we really, Mr. Speaker, take the chance to not fund this insurance policy for another year at really the cost of less than one F-16 fighter aircraft? We have eliminated the funding for the ASRM, so the subcommittee would have no problem finding the \$25 million for Selective Service for next year.

Mr. Speaker, the 18-year-olds in our country are not clamoring to do away with the registration. Over 97 percent, and I got these figures from the Director of Selective Service, over 97 percent of those 18-year-olds have gone to the post office, and they have signed up. I think they are proud to be a part of this program that adds to the security of our Nation. After reaching the age of 26, Mr. Speaker, they are dropped from the rolls.

It seems that the House of Representatives is really the only group that wants to eliminate the Selective Service System. The earlier vote on this amendment was very close, 207 to 202 in the Committee of the Whole, and I really think we have the opportunity today to turn it around.

Of course we all hope that, even if the System is saved, we will never have to go back to the draft. But, as we know, the world is really a dangerous place out there with flames burning in Bosnia, Russia, Somalia, the Middle East, and any of these places could explode into a major crisis and spread into other countries very quickly. A

major use of our forces could call for a draft, and the Selective Service System is in place to implement that mobilization.

Mr. Speaker, this is a strong point that I would like to stress to my colleagues today:

The Director of the Selective Service System tells me they are prepared with the equipment and personnel in an emergency to quickly call up doctors, nurses, medical technicians, and other key personnel in a short time. Even if we might not need draftees in the first months of a war, we need all the medical personnel we can find to treat the wounded. We have a terrible shortage in the military of plastic surgeons and orthopedic surgeons. This is a quick way to call up these health care professionals. We can do it, the Director tells me, within 42 days.

The Selective Service System has a good reputation across the country. The leading citizens in our communities serve on selective service boards without pay. In fact, there are 11,000 unpaid community volunteers who are willing to serve in this capacity, and my colleagues in Congress know of these distinguished citizens in our communities back home. There are only 230 civilian paid jobs in the Selective Service and about 650 part-time military reservists and national guardsmen to work with this volunteer network across the country.

Mr. Speaker, why destroy the Selective Service System when we have no idea what the future holds for the United States in this troubled world? The Director of the Selective Service told me that, if it is not funded today, he is closing down the Selective Service System on December 1. What a tragedy that could be to our country.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support the motion and accept the Senate amendment.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I could not agree with the gentleman more. I wish I had given as clear and as well thought out a set of comments as the gentleman just did.

I might say that the Selective Service System, as well as the entire national security system that we have in our country, is an insurance policy. This is a part of it. We in this Congress are the bottom line for the national defense, and the national security and national interests of our country. The Constitution so states we should live up to that responsibility.

This is a very unsettled world, an uncertain world. Who could have predicted, whether it be Pearl Harbor or Saddam Hussein, their actions to those many 50-plus years ago or just a few years ago?

□ 1700

This is an insurance policy which we cannot let lapse. That is what we are voting on, an insurance policy for the future. Let us vote today to keep it. I support the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], and I support the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] in his motion. I certainly hope it will prevail.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] a veteran, a new Member of this House, and a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], and also the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], on this issue. I join all my colleagues to maintain the Selective Service.

Mr. Speaker, the Selective Service is not a dinosaur of the cold war, but is truly, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] has said, a viable insurance policy for this Nation during a time of peace.

Mr. Speaker, in issues of statecraft, we must decide with our heads, not the emotion of the moment, on whether there is the emotion to cut spending in certain areas. There is a tremendous tone in that, but we have to think with our head. There is greater instability in the world now than ever before. As we debate issues on the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as we look out there at the hot spots around the world, right now, as we downsize the military, we like to talk about what is facing us up to year 1997 with defense cuts, and go to what is called the win-hold-win strategy.

The win-hold-win strategy basically says you can go out there and fight a Desert Storm conflict. And if the recalcitrant commander of North Korea pours across the line, they are supposed to hold until we win the Desert Storm, and then we can go finish out the Korea.

Well, I would hate to be the soldiers in the hold category, especially when we need the rapid response.

So I disagree with my colleagues who say that we can have an immediate rapid response and call up the Selective Service, because it will take up to a year to bring them there.

We talk about a viable insurance policy. This is really a pool. And this pool also sends a message to our youth of greater responsibility. So I disagree with my colleague from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] when he talked about that this really harms the inner-city youth.

No, it does not harm the inner-city youth. It injects greater responsibility and empowers the inner-city youth. The inner-city youth, if we tap into

those and they come forward and they serve the U.S. military, they learn things about discipline and courtesy and respect and reverence and honor. And when you empower the inner city, you bring them to higher levels.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues to maintain the Selective Service and vote "yes."

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT].

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are all looking for ways to cut costs, and I surely have deliberated about cutting the Selective Service. Why do we need it? But I have had firsthand experience with the Selective Service, because I have had to serve in one of those units in previous years.

The Selective Service System is an inexpensive insurance policy in the event of a national emergency. We know of all of the regional and ethnic conflicts in the world that we know will continue. But we also need to know what our manpower is and what our resources are, in a moment's notice, in case of real emergencies.

Ninety-nine percent of all young men turning 18 have no problem with registering and are proud to carry their registration card in their wallets.

Mr. Speaker, these organizations totally support keeping the Selective Service System: American Legion, Non Commissioned Officers Association, Am Vets, Marine Corps League, National Guard Association, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Air Force Sergeants Association, Association of the U.S. Army, Jewish War Veterans, Reserve Officers Association, The Retired Officers Association, Fleet Reserve Association, and Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. Speaker, all of these organizations which represent over 10 million Americans, support the continuation of the Selective Service. Vote "yes" to save the Selective Service.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to associate myself with the comments of my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON]. They are patriots and have supported defense and the military and Selective Service in the past.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue of national security. We have a strange dichotomy in this country. We fight our

wars, like Vietnam, Desert Storm, Somalia, and hopefully not Haiti. But then we scale down our military after that. And what I would like to address is the policy that some Members in the House are directing, which I feel will hurt us in the military.

Mr. Speaker, if we followed the policies of these same individuals that are trying to cut Selective Service in Desert Storm, we would still be there, at a great loss of life. If we followed the policies that we have followed in Somalia, we will lose more lives, and it will not be effective. The policy of putting our troops under U.N. control, this is a policy which is bad. And the same Members are trying to effect the elimination of the Selective Service.

Mr. Speaker, in that dichotomy, where we cut down the troops, in the Clinton package we cut defense \$127 billion, this same group is attacking defense, where 80 percent of the cuts, come after 1996. Where do they want to make all of the cuts? They want to make it in the national security of this country. Even impacted aid in education for students of military families is being cut under the package. Every item under defense, these same people are cutting.

Mr. Speaker, we need to reinstate and keep viable the Selective Service Program. In 1948, when they re-instituted the Selective Service Program, it was because they made a mistake.

Mr. Speaker, to the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], whom I have great respect for, in the inner cities, I think the gentleman would find that every boy and girl, every man and woman, who has entered the service, and even has to sign up and take that responsibility, that is one of the things we try to teach our children, responsibility. Every man and woman that enters the service and accepts that responsibility, and, according to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] 97 percent of them do that, I think they benefit from this program.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we adhere to and maintain the Selective Service System.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to respond to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] for a moment. The gentleman mentioned inner-city youth. I, of course, raised that in my statement. That is one of the basic problems that confront us.

I just want to say that we learned from our hearings that Selective Service did not have any meaningful, effective way of being able to have an outreach program for these inner-city youth. These youth are not particularly attracted to the full service, or at

least not to registering for Selective Service. If, as we found, they do not register, they find themselves penalized by not being able to get loans to go to college, or by not being able to get jobs and things of that sort.

That is one of the basic problems. We do not want to hurt youth. But let me tell you—these young people are very patriotic. But the problem is that the selective service program is not set up effectively to reach them. Yet they wind up being penalized.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, under the program 97 percent of our youth do sign up for this. We are talking about 3 percent that turn out to be mavericks. Those that do, we use this as a tool for our recruiting, which is a benefit to our national security.

So I disagree with the gentleman and say it is a benefit to the inner cities and outer cities as well.

□ 1710

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER].

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, this issue, as surely as any issue we debate, is one of national security policy. It should not be debated, in my opinion, in this context of whether to fund this program or not fund it. It should be made in consultation with the Pentagon, with the Committee on Armed Services and with others who are charged, legally, with the responsibility of focusing and fashioning a national security policy for this country.

To terminate the funding, in my judgment, bypasses all of the safeguards that we have in the Congress as we try to cooperate with the executive branch and make a meaningful national security policy.

May I further say that to terminate right now would send a chilling signal, in my opinion, to the rest of the world as it relates to our resolve to exercise our responsibility in the world as the world's foremost source for peace. To terminate this program now, to eradicate the database that exists therein, would take, as some have said, a year to reconstruct. We may not have a year because, my colleagues, as certain as I am standing here, the only certainty in this uncertain world is further uncertainty. That has been said again and again by people who are far more learned than I am.

I would just say in this day when we are trying to fashion MediGuard to utilize our Reserve Forces so that when we have that national emergency in the future, God forbid it should ever come, we have the ability to respond and to protect our troops.

As the chairman said earlier, this program should be sustained now.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do not believe there is any Member of the House speaking to this issue who does not want to play a role to make certain that America is ready, should we need to exercise quickly men and women serving their country at a time of crisis. Five hundred thousand well-trained and equipped American fighting men and women were deployed to the Persian Gulf theater, halfway around the world, without a mandatory draft. That deployment did not come near to exhausting our Reserve capabilities, and the operation's success speaks volumes about what we can accomplish with All-Volunteer Forces.

We stopped drafting people in 1973 and did not reestablish the Selective Service System until 1979, precisely when the Soviets invaded Afghanistan. That means we did without a draft for 6 years during the very height of the cold war.

The draft is currently capable of delivering 100,000 inductees within 28 days of mobilization. Current DOD war fighting doctrine would utilize untrained draftees only in the event of a global war. If we have a national security need, it is to maintain a trained force structure that is made up of volunteers rather than mobilizing inductees.

The system is working at this point, and there is little question that the American people will respond should we face a time of crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the very distinguished ranking Republican on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, one of the most respected Members of this House.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of preserving our Nation's Selective Service System.

Regretably, and I believe that all of our colleagues recognize it, we are living in troubled times, when our Nation is being called upon to provide peace-makers and peacekeepers in hot spots throughout the world: in Somalia, in Haiti, and the possibility at a later date in Bosnia.

What are the underlying costs of this issue before us and what are we complaining about? We are complaining about a possible \$25 million expenditure compared to a total budget, a defense budget of over a quarter of a trillion dollars. It seems to me that \$25 million is an inexpensive insurance policy to make certain that we will be prepared to meet any future emergency—dollars well spent to assure our preparedness in the event of any major emergency. To rebuild this system that we are about to tear apart, if we do not approve this proposal, it is estimated it would take over a year to put our Selective Service System back in place,

not to mention regathering all the volunteers who are involved in this system.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to recede to the Senate's position, partially restoring funding for our Nation's Selective Service System.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Here we are again. This House has already spoken on this issue. This House has already determined that the cold war is over, that the Soviets are out of Afghanistan, and we no longer need to make a political statement in the face of that Soviet invasion, which is what Jimmy Carter did when he reinstated the draft, despite the fact that his own director of the Selective Service Bernard Rotzger, had already developed a comprehensive report that said that draft registration was unneeded and draft registration would do nothing, draft registration would do nothing to enhance the readiness of this country.

Mr. Speaker, mostly on the other side of the aisle and some on this aisle, seem to underestimate the willingness of the American people to regard serious threats to the United States and to live up to their patriotic duty. In every major American conflict around the world, every war that we have entered into, the volunteers exceeded the capacity of our training facilities for months until that war. In the case of the gulf war, 6 months after mobilization began, we still had Reservists queued up and waiting for training.

There is not the training capacity to bring the raw recruits forward, unless Members are anticipating casualties on the sort of scenario of 500,000 or 600,000 in a very short period of time. There is no threat that the Department of Defense can anticipate that would bring that about, absent a reintegrated and mobilized Soviet Union invading Europe. Of course, they have to fight their way through Eastern Europe first, so I think we would have quite a bit of notice and quite a bit of time to get our forces, again, get them mobilized and get them trained.

There is no realistic threat under which we are going to use these lists of 18- to 26-year-old Americans. There is no need for this. It is a cold war relic.

Colleagues, let us not just say, "Oh, it is just \$29 million. We can't be bothered with cutting that out of the budget." Cutting the budget has to start somewhere. If Members are unwilling to cut the super collider at a billion, they are unwilling to cut the space station, they are unwilling to cut the solid fuel rocket motors, let us start here, \$29 million for an outmoded cold war relic.

□ 1720

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HUTTO].

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I applaud the eloquent statement that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] as well as others have made on the importance of Selective Service.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs made one excellent point that I would like for him to amplify on. He mentioned that in the gulf war, if the situation had arisen and we needed more, I know the Active Forces, the Reserves, do a tremendous job, but we do not know what emergencies may come up. We did not know we were going to have the gulf war.

I would ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], how long would it take if we had to draw on this reservoir of registrants.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTTO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, it would take at least a year or longer. We have the statistics to prove that. The gentleman makes a great point about the Persian Gulf war.

On the Persian Gulf war, we were on the edge of having to implement the draft. If we would have had more casualties in the Persian Gulf war, the volunteers would have fallen off tremendously and we would have gone to the draft. We are only talking about 2 years ago that we nearly went to the draft, anyway.

Certainly, let us not throw out the whole system today. I hope our colleagues would vote "aye."

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. We have talked about the readiness of our forces, and again, the Active Reserve and the Guard do a great service, but we have heard a lot about insurance today. I think for the security of our Nation we should retain the Selective Service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair would observe that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] has the right to close debate.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just briefly respond to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], because he brought up the young people in our inner cities, about whom we are all so concerned. When I look at our military today, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] talked about this a little

bit, they are the best-trained, they are the best-equipped, the most highly motivated young men and women, I think, ever to serve in our military. I was over in the Persian Gulf and I have been with our NATO troops in Europe, they are truly outstanding.

The big thing is that they are a real cross-section of America. They come from all walks of life. That is what is so necessary. I look at some of the kids I have talked with who served in the military after coming from the inner city. They served for 2 years, 3 years, 4 years.

I was talking to one the other day who had been in the military for 20 years, a career officer. He is a black man. He is so proud of his service. When he got out, he did like all the rest, he went back to the inner city. He went back to where he grew up and became a citizen. He told me, "You know, I learned respect. I learned the meaning of the words 'patriotism, voluntarism, pride'. I learned how not to use drugs. I even got a little religion."

That is what he took back to his community. That is how important this is.

Mr. STOKES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I am glad to yield to my best friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. I can appreciate very much what the gentleman is saying. I have no doubt that this young man feels exactly that way.

The point is that the gentleman did that, that the young man did that without the Selective Service requiring him to do that. He did that as a volunteer youth. He went into the service, and there is no problem with that. We are getting plenty of inner-city youth who volunteer. Some people are claiming there are too many inner-city youth in the military.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, can I reclaim my time? The gentleman has time of his own.

Mr. STOKES. I would yield the gentleman additional time, if he wants.

If the gentleman will continue to yield, I just want to say to the gentleman that he is making an effective argument, I think, for the fact that we do not need selective service. These young men will volunteer as patriots.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman just made my point. The whole point is that in so many of the big cities, in particular, the school boards do not want to let our military recruiters come onto these campuses and explain to students that there is a career there where they can better themselves and come home later on and make their communities a better place to live. That is why we need this enrollment list, so we can reach out and get those young people. Otherwise, nobody

tells them. The guidance counselors will not tell them.

Mr. Speaker, let me just sum up by saying that back on June 28, this House rejected this same amendment to restore 80 percent of the recommended funds, tightening the belt of the Selective Service System but keeping it going. We lost by one vote.

Mr. Speaker, since that time, when this amendment lost by one vote, there has been a near revolution in Russia. Members do not realize how close that attempted coup came to putting hard-line Communists back in power, with their fingers on the triggers of nuclear weapons. Mr. Speaker, we have just had some tragic losses in Somalia. And now there is even talk of putting 25,000 troops into a place called Bosnia, into an internal dispute that Hitler could not solve with 42 divisions and 200,000 men. We need to be prepared. That is all this amendment does.

Mr. Speaker, I ask every Member of this House to please vote "yes" on this motion to recede to the Senate position. We will then send this legislation directly to the President. He will sign it, and we will be on our way home, eating turkey on Thanksgiving at home instead of being here on this floor arguing. I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think we can see from the debate that has taken place on this floor this afternoon why we brought this matter back in true disagreement from the Senate. There obviously is a very genuine, philosophical difference on this issue on both sides. I think it is an important debate. I also think it is important for us to realize that the Committee on Appropriations, the committee that has to fund this program, has a responsibility to report to the House when we have a situation of this sort.

We made inquiry into this program. We did not just suddenly say, "Take \$25 million out of a program," just picking it out of the air. We held hearings on this matter. We talked with Selective Service. We had input from the Department of Defense. So this matter was fairly gone into in order to try and bring to the House what we felt would be a responsible recommendation.

One of the things I would like to clear up is the fact that the period of a year to reconstitute Selective Service has been mentioned several times here today. In the testimony that came before our subcommittee we were told that it would take 6 months to reconstitute Selective Service.

What we are talking about here today, however, is not any lack of patriotism on the part of American youth. There has never been a lack of patriotism on the part of any of America's youth. They have responded to

every war, every national emergency this country has ever had. In fact, part of the problem is that we get too many. We cannot even utilize all of them. It is not a question of patriotism, it is a question of whether we continue to put \$25 million a year into an archaic system.

Mr. Speaker, we have not used this system now in 20 years. We did not use it for Grenada, we did not use it for Desert Storm—we have not needed it for any of the skirmishes we have been involved in around the world. This is \$25 million a year that we are putting into an archaic system.

Mr. Speaker, the Selective Service had said to us that they could deliver 100,000 inductees 28 days after mobilization. When we asked some questions, the Department of Defense stated, and I am going to quote from the testimony before our subcommittee, that they did not intend " * * * to utilize draftees unless it becomes necessary to reconstitute our forces to a level sufficient to deal with a global war. Under these circumstances, new or expanded training bases would be constituted prior to mobilization."

In other words, DOD does not have the facilities to train and house the draftees once they are inducted.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOKES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, one of the points is that I was a volunteer myself. I was not inducted under the Selective Service. I also know that during Vietnam we had many volunteers. I would like to think that those volunteers that are patriotic, that serve their country, also be supported by those that do not want to volunteer. Selective service provides that those Americans that choose to avoid the draft are also held responsible and support their country.

Mr. STOKES. In that vein, Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman, I think, is forgetting about a very real problem we have with inner-city youth. We have the same problem that relates to the census, the reason there is an undercount, because many of them do not want to be on registration, and they are not told to register and things of that sort.

□ 1730

In this case they are penalized if they do not register. But in the same category you have many young men who go into the service simply because they cannot even find a job out here in our society. So they go in there to be able to get a job, to get a chance to go to college and get an education, and things of this sort.

So the basic problem is not the one the gentleman mentions. The basic problem is the fact that we do not want to penalize young men for not registering for an arcane system.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STOKES. I would just say, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I hope that the House today will realize that once before we did take the money out of Selective Service. When we went to the Senate we maintained the House position, and that is why we brought it back, that all this money should be taken out of Selective Service. I urge my colleagues to vote down the Solomon-Montgomery motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, will the House recede from its disagreement with the Senate to Senate amendment No. 129 and concur therein?

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 194, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 515]

YEAS—236

Abercrombie	Combest	Greenwood
Andrews (NJ)	Condit	Gunderson
Andrews (TX)	Cooper	Hall (TX)
Armey	Costello	Hancock
Bachus (AL)	Cramer	Hansen
Baessler	Crapo	Harman
Baker (CA)	Cunningham	Hastert
Baker (LA)	Darden	Hayes
Ballenger	Deal	Hefley
Barca	Diaz-Balart	Herger
Barcia	Dickey	Hilliard
Barlow	Doolittle	Hoagland
Bartlett	Dornan	Hochbrueckner
Barton	Dreier	Hoekstra
Bateman	Duncan	Holden
Bentley	Dunn	Houghton
Bereuter	Edwards (TX)	Hoyer
Bevill	Emerson	Hughes
Bilbray	English (OK)	Hunter
Bilirakis	Everett	Hutchinson
Bishop	Ewing	Hutto
Billey	Fawell	Hyde
Blute	Fields (LA)	Inglis
Boehlert	Fields (TX)	Inhofe
Boehner	Fingerhut	Johnson (GA)
Bonilla	Fish	Johnson, E. B.
Brewster	Fowler	Johnson, Sam
Brooks	Franks (CT)	Kim
Browder	Frost	King
Brown (FL)	Galleghy	Kingston
Bryant	Gallo	Klink
Bunning	Gekas	Kolbe
Burton	Geren	Kyl
Buyer	Gibbons	Lancaster
Callahan	Gillmor	Lantos
Calvert	Gilman	Laughlin
Canady	Gingrich	Lazio
Castle	Goodlatte	Levy
Clement	Goodling	Lewis (FL)
Clinger	Gordon	Lightfoot
Clyburn	Goss	Linder
Coble	Grams	Lipinski
Collins (GA)	Grandy	Livingston

Lloyd
Machtley
Manzullo
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)

Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Rowland
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Shaw
Shepherd
Siskiy
Skeen
Skeltion
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)

Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Talent
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thurman
Torkildsen
Valentine
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Weldon
Whitten
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NAYS—194

Ackerman	Frank (MA)	McKinney
Allard	Franks (NJ)	Meehan
Andrews (ME)	Furse	Mfume
Applegate	Gedjenson	Miller (CA)
Archer	Gephardt	Miller (FL)
Bacchus (FL)	Gilchrist	Mineta
Barrett (NE)	Glickman	Minge
Barrett (WI)	Gonzalez	Mink
Becerra	Green	Moakley
Bellenson	Gutierrez	Mollohan
Berman	Hall (OH)	Murphy
Blackwell	Hamburg	Nadler
Bonior	Hamilton	Neal (MA)
Borski	Hastings	Neal (NC)
Boucher	Hefner	Nussle
Brown (CA)	Hinchey	Oberstar
Brown (OH)	Hobson	Obey
Byrne	Hoke	Oliver
Camp	Horn	Ortiz
Cantwell	Huffington	Owens
Cardin	Inslee	Pastor
Carr	Istook	Payne (NJ)
Chapman	Jacobs	Pelosi
Clay	Jefferson	Penny
Clayton	Johnson (CT)	Peterson (MN)
Coleman	Johnston	Pomeroy
Collins (IL)	Kanjorski	Price (NC)
Collins (MI)	Kaptur	Rangel
Conyers	Kasich	Reynolds
Coppersmith	Kennedy	Rohrabacher
Cox	Kennelly	Rose
Coyne	Kildee	Rostenkowski
Crane	Klecza	Roth
Danner	Klein	Roybal-Allard
de la Garza	Klug	Royce
DeFazio	Knollenberg	Rush
DeLauro	Kopetski	Sabo
DeLay	Kreidler	Sanders
Dellums	LaFalce	Santorum
Derrick	Lambert	Sawyer
Deutsch	LaRocco	Schenk
Dicks	Leach	Schroeder
Dingell	Lehman	Schumer
Dixon	Levin	Scott
Dooley	Lewis (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Durbin	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Edwards (CA)	Long	Sharp
English (AZ)	Lowe	Shays
Eshoo	Maloney	Shuster
Evans	Mann	Skaggs
Farr	Manton	Slattery
Fazio	Margolies-	Slaughter
Filner	Mezvisinsky	Stark
Flake	Markey	Stokes
Foglietta	Martinez	Strickland
Ford (MI)	Matsui	Studds
Ford (TN)	McDermott	Swift

Synar	Upton	Waxman
Thornton	Velazquez	Wheat
Torres	Vento	Williams
Torricelli	Visclosky	Woolsey
Towns	Walker	Wyden
Trafficant	Washington	Wynn
Tucker	Waters	Yates
Unsoeld	Watt	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—3

Engel	Johnson (SD)	Tauzin
-------	--------------	--------

□ 1751

Ms. SCHENK, Mrs. MALONEY, and Messrs. LEHMAN, TORRES, LEWIS of California, BONIOR, and PAYNE of New Jersey changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BARLOW and Mr. SPRATT changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the House receded from its disagreement with the Senate to Senate amendment No. 129 and concurred therein.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and the several motions was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, on October 19, I missed rollcall vote 512 due to my participation in meetings on the Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1994. For the record, had I been present I would have voted:

Rollcall 512, "no."

WITHDRAWAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2380

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 2380.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS REPORTED FROM CONFERENCE IN DISAGREEMENT ON H.R. 2520, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-301) on the resolution (H. Res. 279) relating to the consideration of amendments reported from conference in disagreement on the bill (H.R. 2520) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2401, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2401) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KENNELLY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SPENCE

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SPENCE moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendments to the bill H.R. 2401 be instructed to insist upon the provisions contained in section 1051 of the House bill (relating to involvement of United States Armed Forces in Somalia).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Madam Speaker, a few weeks ago, during consideration of the Defense authorization bill, we adopted the Gephardt-Gilman amendment which provided for, among other things, that we would have a vote on continuing our operations in Somalia before November 15.

Since we completed work on the Defense authorization bill, the situation in Somalia has changed. Since that time, the administration, pursuant to our request, has issued a report on our involvement in that country, and the bottom line is this: We went to Somalia for humanitarian reasons and humanitarian purposes; we have successfully completed that mission, and we started withdrawing our troops from Somalia.

After that time, the United Nations passed a resolution changing our mission from that of a humanitarian effort to that of using military force against one of the political factions in Somalia. Our country supported that resolution in the United Nations. We bought into this new mission.

Our U.S. military was used to enforce the hunt for General Aideed. Our military thereafter in that pursuit lost lives, had people captured. We call them detainees. We had people wounded and we saw on national television the bodies of some of our service people being dragged through the streets of that city.

□ 1800

After an outcry from the citizens of this country, the administration has now changed the policy we have been pursuing, and the President has set a deadline for withdrawal from Somalia of March 31, 1994. There are added questions which remain:

Why March 31, 1994? Why not 1 month earlier or 1 month after that? Why are we still there? Why is there a time definite with such importance attached to it? Why not leave Somalia as soon as possible?

In any event, the only occasion this body will have to express ourselves in this matter is right now. The other body has had ample time to fully debate the new developments; we have not; and so this is the reason for my motion to instruct, to give this body time to debate these new events.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the motion to instruct House conferees to the conference on H.R. 2401, the fiscal year 1994 Defense authorization bill, to insist on the Gilman-Gephardt amendment.

This amendments call on the President to report to Congress by October 15 on the administration's policy in Somalia, and to seek, and receive, by November 15, congressional authorization for continued deployment of United States military forces in Somalia.

It is gratifying to note that the President has already complied with the language calling for a report. However, the President has not requested authorization for continued operations in Somalia as contemplated by the Gilman-Gephardt amendment. Nor has the Congress, in particular the House, debated such basic issues as the terms, conditions, and termination of the Somalia operation in light of the President's report.

The President has said that it would be disastrous for us to cut and run in Somalia right now. Instead, the President promises that we will cut and run on March 31, 1994, even if the political situation in Somalia has not improved by then.

As the New York Times observed about this policy in its editorial of October 8 entitled "Somalia: Time to Get Out,"—and I quote—"The Administration could easily find itself spilling

considerably more blood, both American and Somali, for the next six months without accomplishing much in a cause unrelated to any direct American interest."

Many of us agree with the New York Times editorial that the United States has done its job of providing humanitarian relief in Somalia, and that our troops should be withdrawn sooner than March 31. Accordingly, I have introduced legislation—H.R. 3292—along with the ranking member of our Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], designed to ensure that our troops are out by January 31.

Madam Speaker, after reading the President's Report on Somalia that was submitted to the Congress last week, I am more concerned than ever that this administration is digging us even deeper into the sand trap that Somalia has become. Rather than clarifying its policy there, the report spells out confusing and often conflicting objectives.

In particular, I am dismayed that after stating our Nation's intention to be out by next March 31, the President goes on to report that he is now sending a total of 3,000 additional ground troops to Somalia.

That is some 1,300 troops above the 1,700 he announced last week—and separate from the 3,600 troops that will be part of the offshore rapid deployment unit.

All together, when this new deployment is completed, we will have more than doubled the number of American troops committed to the U.N. mission in Somalia—from less than 5,000 to more than 11,000.

All of us applaud the cease-fire that seems to be in place there now—and the shift in focus from going after the warlord Mohammed Aided to seeking a political solution. But there are no guarantees that this will continue. We may well be in the eye of a hurricane that could engulf us at any time through a poorly planned activity or a misjudgment of intent.

Madam Speaker, the issue of terminating our military involvement in Somalia is too important a matter to be addressed through an amendment to another piece of legislation—with all of the time and other limits that approach entails.

This issue is so important that the Congress—in particular this body—must address it on its own terms by debating and discussing a free standing measure.

That is why I have introduced legislation to require the withdrawal of all U.S. troops by January 31.

This date gives the administration and the Pentagon enough time to plan for an orderly withdrawal of our forces—and at the same time, Congress will be in session and able to address any circumstances that might call for a reexamination of that date.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and I hope that hearings will be speedily scheduled on this so that the House can fulfill its responsibilities to the American people on this very important matter as soon as possible.

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker and Members of the House, from a parliamentary perspective what is before us at this time is a motion to instruct conferees on the part of the House to maintain the House position on Somalia. I can submit to my colleagues to a moral certainty that the House will maintain the House position on policy toward Somalia for a very practical reason:

The House passed the Gephardt-Gilman amendment that is the exact same language contained in the counterpart legislation in the other body. So, as a practical matter, Madam Speaker, the motion to instruct is simply an opportunity on the part of my distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle to debate Somalia, and I think that that is wholly appropriate. They are not asking us to maintain the House position because they know that the House position will be maintained. But I think that my colleagues do a service to this body anytime we assume the responsibility to engage in an important debate on a matter of this significance that is timely, important and relevant to the American people, to the Somali people, to the United Nations, indeed to the world.

Having made those comments, Madam Speaker, let me now make a few remarks regarding the debate on Somalia.

Madam Speaker, Members of the House, the decisions, the changes in the world, that bring us to this moment have been breathtaking both in their speed and in their impact. Just a short time ago none of us believed that the Berlin Wall would come tumbling down, that the Warsaw Pact would evaporate and that the Soviet Union would dissipate. But the fact of the matter is these are the realities. The cold war is now over.

For the past 40-plus years many became experts in the politics of the cold war. But I would submit, Madam Speaker, that there are no experts in this post-cold war environment. Ph.D's, brilliant scholars, learned and distinguished colleagues notwithstanding, there are no experts in the post-cold war.

I would submit, Madam Speaker, that each step that we take away from the Berlin Wall, each step that we take away from the end of the cold war, is a step into uncharted waters.

□ 1810

It is a step into the unknown, a step into the future, a step into transition.

It is a step fraught with risk, potential dangers, the ability to make mistakes, but also great opportunities for us in this country and for people around the world. Great possibilities.

In this post-cold war environment, as we evolve what America's role in this new world order is to be, as we evolve what the new role of the United States shall be, we will embrace a whole new lexicon that did not exist in our minds just a short period ago.

Madam Speaker, we are now talking about peacekeeping, peacekeeping-plus, peacemaking, and peace enforcement. These were terms not in our lexicon in the context of the cold war.

So we are now groping. America is groping. The world is groping toward a new reality. How do we engage the world in a post-cold war environment?

Madam Speaker, we are going to make mistakes. We are going to experience difficulties. We are going to see weaknesses.

But the mistakes we make need to be corrected, the difficulties we experience need to be overcome, and the weaknesses that we see need to be strengthened; not simply used as platforms for shallow criticism, but problems out there that must be solved.

Madam Speaker, I might be wrong, but I believe that the Somalias of the world, the Bosnias of the world, the Haitis of the world, are the new realities. We are no longer in a bipolar us-versus-them world where we could study the politics of war. We are now about the business of learning the difficult and arduous task of trying to figure out how to wage the peace. It is very difficult in a nation that has studied war for well over four decades.

So we look at Somalia. Tens of thousands of Somali people were falling dead, Madam Speaker. Many of us saw this as an incredible thing that was happening when thousands of people, thousands of miles away, were falling dead for the simple reality that they lacked food. But, more often than not, they did not lack food because it was not available, but the situation was hostile, the environment was hostile.

The United States decided to play a role in the context of Somalia. We took the moral high ground. We said that in the new world, thousands of people should not fall over dead simply because they do not have enough to eat. And, as a great Nation, we decided to do something. We took the moral high ground. For the most part, we were successful beyond our wildest imaginations throughout most of Somalia.

But then we got caught up in Mogadishu. I would submit, Madam Speaker, that at the point where our mission shifted from a humanitarian mission, shifted from focusing on a political track and began to engage in military missions, is at the point

where our moral high ground was eroded, a point where our policy of humanitarian assistance and political endeavor was seriously compromised.

Madam Speaker, I believe we made a mistake, that we never should have been pursuing a military operation in Somalia. We never went to Somalia to wage war.

It staggers the imagination to consider that the same hands that just a few months ago handed out food to dying people could end up being the hands dispensing death. We did not go to Somalia to kill; we went to Somalia to help and assist.

So we got caught up in mistakes. But I am pleased, Madam Speaker, that this President saw the need to identify the mistake.

We are a great Nation, and greatness is not simply one's capacity to destroy and be the bully on the block, as we have been referred to now that we have won the cold war. Greatness in a nation is the ability to recognize a mistake has been made, to rectify the mistake, and to make mid-course change.

If this country saw that we made a mistake in pursuing military options in Somalia and perverted and distorted what we were doing there, it took greatness to then say this was a mistake, let us turn it around.

How many times have we slipped down the slippery slope toward violence and retaliation and more retaliation and more violence, and, suddenly, there we are, with 10,000, 20,000, 50,000, 100,000 troops, a full-blown war, death, and destruction?

I was excited about the fact that this President was willing to say this was a mistake. We cannot continue to go down this road of retaliation and violence and war, and must turn it around.

Madam Speaker, the President has done that. The President, as requested by the Congress, has submitted his mission report on Somalia, and, as understood by those of us who are committed to saving lives in Somalia, the President has reaffirmed the humanitarian role of our soldiers there and has stated categorically that the problems of Somalia and our response to these problems will be political and not military.

The impact of this simple shift in U.S. policy was both swift and dramatic. Attacks on peacekeepers ceased. General Aideed issued a unilateral ceasefire. The release of CWO Michael Durant became imminent, and is now a reality.

The United States of America has successfully navigated an important turn in this, our first real post-cold war challenge. We must resist again being sidetracked by the doomsdayers, the naysayers, and those committed to snatching failure from the jaws of victory. We have regained the moral and practical high ground in Somalia, and

indeed we must keep it, Madam Speaker, because for so many decades flexing of our military muscle was an important part of our relationship with the rest of the world. Some of us now are having great difficulty accepting the legitimacy of negotiation and reconciliation as guiding principles in relations between nations and peoples.

Madam Speaker, this is a new day, a new opportunity, a new set of challenges. Diplomacy has worked, is working, and will continue to work in Somalia, if only we stay the course and complete the positive and welcome task originally begun as Operation Restore Hope.

Madam Speaker, we must not withdraw prior to the President's March 31 deadline. We must not revert to the militaristic posture that cost so many lives on all sides and so sidetracked our basic mission. We must build on the dramatic progress that our renewed emphasis on diplomacy has brought.

Madam Speaker, my final comment is that I said earlier we now are thrust into a position where we must now learn how to wage peace, and I accept the responsibility of governance here. We are the only superpower on the planet.

Madam Speaker, we won the cold war. It is over. We do not have to prove our prowess on a street in Mogadishu or in a seaport town in Haiti. We are, without challenge, the most powerful military force on the face of the Earth. We could make holes in the ground where these two nations exist.

That is not the question. The question is, Should we be about that? Madam Speaker, I am saying in a post-cold war world, we should not be about that. We, as the only superpower on the face of this Earth, must show restraint. Because when you are the toughest person on the block, you have to show restraint.

Strength brings responsibility, and we must show restraint. But beyond that, we must show the world that there are alternative ways of solving international disputes and problems in nation states. Not simply deploying troops and gunboat diplomacy or engaging in military tactics. That is our challenge.

Madam Speaker, I have waited 23 years for this moment to come. We are now in a post-cold war era. Now the battle is being waged on our turf. And I stand here saying that our challenge today and our challenge tomorrow is to learn how to wage the peace, to figure out what role we are going to use our military forces in.

□ 1820

There are those who believe that the only purpose for our military forces is to prepare to fight world war IV and that we should withdraw from any responsibility, and any other nations in the world, except build a mighty mili-

tary machine, withdraw from any other involvement in the planet and prepare to wage world war IV. That is a point of view. I accept that as a point of view that can legitimately be held by people. I simply dissent from it.

I believe that there is an alternate view. The alternative view is, since we have won the cold war, is to learn how to win peace, learn how to show the world by example that we do not need more weapons and proliferation and more capacity to destroy, that negotiation, diplomacy, and political solution at the end of the day is the greatest thing that can happen to us.

Our children, Madam Speaker, demand it. Their parents want it. The future dictates it.

Madam Speaker, with those remarks, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The gentleman from California makes a very good point. I think this debate we are having today evidently does not come down to partisanship. It seems that we agree on the very important point of our involvement in foreign affairs in other countries.

When it is not in our vital interest to do it, not in our national interest to do it and they are trying to solve these questions for themselves, we should not be involved in those militarily.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Madam Speaker, it is always fascinating to hear the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. He has much to say and well worth listening to. I would only say, in addition to my agreeing with much that he did say, that we did not start the killing in Somalia, that General Aideed killed 24 Pakistanis who were engaged, possibly, on a fool's errand to disarm General Aideed.

I think the notion was there were too many warlords over there with too many weapons, which resulted in the maldistribution of food. But nonetheless, I agree with the basic thrust of what the gentleman said, that the mission changed, that our national interest had a moral component that was fulfilled in feeding starving people. But then, when we moved the mission into nation-building, trying to impose a democracy or some form of viable government on a country that had not had one for many, many, many generations, we lost that humanitarian sense of mission and the mission was distorted into nation building.

We need a full debate here on the rapid changes that are going on in foreign policy in this country and under this administration. In the last several weeks, 18 Americans have died in Somalia. And yet, our continued presence there is without a coherent policy to justify it.

In remarks about Somalia 2 weeks ago, President Clinton said, "Let us

finish the work we set out to do. Let us demonstrate to the world that when Americans take on a challenge, they do the job right." But 5 months before, on May 5, President Clinton welcomed home the men and women who had participated in the humanitarian mission started by President Bush in December. That day on the White House lawn the President said:

Welcome home, and thank you for a job very well done. You have proved again that our involvement in multilateral efforts need not be open-ended nor ill-defined, that we can go abroad and accomplish some distinct objectives and then come home again, when the mission is accomplished.

Well, we did and he did not. We accomplished the Bush mission, as the President acknowledged, but we did not bring our troops home. Instead, President Clinton reduced our troop levels there and turned over command to the United Nations to achieve a new mission of nation building and political reconciliation.

The failure of this mission is now obvious. We need an exit strategy. Our purpose for remaining there is hopelessly confused.

The administration says we are no longer pursuing Aideed but, instead, are trying to marginalize him. But then our Army Rangers are ordered to raid a hotel where it is hoped to capture him or senior advisers, and the result is 18 dead Americans, 75 wounded, 3 missing, and 1 released captive of a force of about 100. Again, to what purpose?

Following the mauling of our Rangers in Mogadishu, Secretary of Defense Aspin has been mildly contrite about his unfortunate decision to deny tanks and armored vehicles to support our soldiers in Somalia. I am not aware that he has even addressed the catastrophic decision to withdraw from the region several AC-130 aircraft whose absence inexcusably left our Rangers and other forces without air support.

The administration obviously believes that staying in Somalia another 6 months is necessary to keep alive the esoteric policy of assertive multilateralism. Is this what propels the administration to send young men and women on ill-conceived missions that have nothing to do with protecting vital American interests? Is this what drives the President to send a shipload of soldiers, some of whom have sidearms, to Haiti with the understanding that they will be protected by the Haitian military, the very people most likely to harm them?

Is this what recently inspired administration support for expansive United Nations missions to Rwanda, Georgia, Liberia, all internal conflicts that do not threaten vital United States interests and do not threaten international peace and security?

The U.S. forces should not be squandered in this administration's experi-

ments to cast the United Nations as miracle worker. We cannot expect every warlord and terrorist thug to get religion at the sight of a blue beret.

We need to withdraw our men and women from Somalia long before March 31. This is not cutting and running. It is about competence and making the tough decisions.

We need hearings. We need debate on just where our foreign policy is heading and leave the nation building in Somalia to those countries with cultural, political, historical, and geographic ties to the region.

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCURDY].

Mr. McCURDY. Madam Speaker, it is a shame that we are having this debate today. We should have had it a month ago. At that time, actually, when we had a previous vote, this Congress overwhelmingly supported the Bush initiative moving into Somalia. And I think it would be wrong for us to say today that the policy in Somalia has been a failure.

We overlook the fact that throughout the country of Somalia we see the many good works of United States involvement there. The country is on its way to being self-sufficient and being able to feed itself. The feeding stations have been closed throughout the country, and it is clear that those Americans who were tragically killed in Somalia have not died in vain. I think it would be irresponsible for anyone to say that that was the case.

It is also clear that in this day and age of the post cold war that there may not be anything described as a purely humanitarian mission. In Somalia, food was used as a weapon, chaos was a tool of some of the clan members, and we did not fully understand the willingness of some to use violence to achieve their end. And I think it is obvious that the West and the industrialized world did not have a clear appreciation of the dangers that awaited them in that country.

□ 1830

Madam Speaker, the United Nations is not properly organized today for the task of nation-building. They are just now learning how to do that. I believe there have been some tragic mistakes. What I am concerned about, however, is the standing of the United States by a hasty retreat from Somalia. I believe that arbitrary deadlines by this Congress could work against our best interest in the long term.

I say that not as one who is up here defending this administration. I have been in this Congress 13 years. I have served under three Presidents, two Republicans and one Democrat. I made the same comments when Ronald Reagan was President, that Congress should not be tying the administra-

tions hands. I made the same argument when George Bush was President, and supported the use of force in the Gulf war. I will make the same argument here today.

As a matter of fact, Senator DOLE in December of 1990, in a speech regarding U.S. involvement in the Persian Gulf, said that "there are those in Congress who want to tie the President's hands behind his back." Someone asked him the other day about that statement. He said, "That was then and this is now."

I do not believe that is the case. I would appeal to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work together to develop policies that make sense, that use common sense as a guide. My chairman talks about the need to wage peace. How do we wage peace in this new day and age? There are some who describe it as the new world order. George Bush actually helped coin the term. I would disagree somewhat. I do not believe there is a lot of new order. I believe there is a lot of disorder. The world is not that peaceful. Just ask the Moslems in Bosnia or the Serbs or the Croats, the Georgians, the Abkhazians, the Azeris or the Armenians. We can go around the world and see those who believe that "just negotiation" is not going to resolve their conflicts.

We have, Madam Speaker, interests both national and international to see that those conflicts are resolved, and at times there will be a call for the use of force. The question is, how do we develop a foreign policy that makes sense?

My personal opinion is that it may be premature to expect a fully articulated foreign policy to replace the foreign policy that guided this country for over 50 years, one of containment.

If the Members read the "X article" by George Kennan years ago, it took time to develop the policy of containment. I believe we are going to go through a similar process. There are, however, some principles that we should keep in mind. National interest is one of those. National interest should guide much of our actions, especially when it is resorting to the use of force.

Mr. Speaker, we should, and we have learned through the decade of the 1980's and now through the 1990's that it is better to work in coalitions, to work with our allies wherever possible. Multilateralism, however, is not the goal of a foreign policy. It is not a substitute for a foreign policy. It is a tool. Working in coalitions is desirable whenever possible, but it is not the objective.

Those of us who consider ourselves internationalists cannot even argue that avoidance of isolationism is a foreign policy, either. We need to look at those areas that are in our national interest, and at the same time, there are threats to our security and threats to the stability of the world that are important.

Madam Speaker, it appears to me that the most important foreign policy issue facing the United States today is that of Russia, seeing that a stable, democratic society emerges from the current conflict and instability there. The other component has to be expanding the open global trading system, which is an economic component. I believe the President has done an excellent job articulating the connectedness of international economics and our own national interest.

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, we have second tier problems. We have North Korea that will emerge as a potential crisis in just a matter of weeks. The Bosnias and the Somalias will be there as well, but those should not be guiding the rest of our foreign policy or capturing the entire interest of this administration.

Madam Speaker, the appeal that I would make today, is for both sides to avoid the partisanship, the cheap shots and second-guessing. It is now time for the United States to develop a foreign policy, one based on what is best in our own national interests, but also that recognizes the changing, evolving nature of the world. In our effort to achieve a coherent foreign policy, we should keep in mind the old axiom that in foreign policy partisanship should end at the water's edge.

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. WELDON. Madam Speaker, let us cut through all the rhetoric and get to the real issue of why we are here today. I think the chairman hit it. The issue here today is that we need to debate this policy, this foreign policy issue of Somalia, and Madam Speaker, we need a vote on this issue. We have spent over \$2 billion in the Somalia operation since we first committed our troops last year. We have seen 29 young Americans who have come home in body bags because of our policy there, and the changing of the mission, which has not been fully supported by this Congress and the American people.

The idea that somehow we can gag Members and not give them an opportunity to vote on this issue, which our constituents are clamoring for us to have a vote on, is outrageous. We tried to offer an amendment to the defense authorization bill just last month. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], our ranking Member, tried to have an up-or-down vote on whether or not to pull our troops out of Somalia and cut off the funds. We were denied that opportunity. Instead, we were given a sham resolution, and 26 of us on this floor voted against that sham res-

olution, because we said it was nothing more than a CYA effort to give us cover in case something tragic happened.

That following weekend 18 young Americans were killed when their helicopters were attacked in the fighting in Mogadishu. Madam Speaker, we need to debate this issue. The administration cannot keep having us run away from it. We have to debate it up front and the American people need to see us talking about what our policy should be and how long we should be deployed.

Madam Speaker, we do not even know now whether or not that sham resolution, which said we should have a vote by November 15, is going to give us a vote. No one will say that on the record, whether or not we are going to have a vote, so in fact that resolution we passed in September was exactly what we called it, it was a sham. It was just designed to give us some cover.

Madam Speaker, we had a hearing today with Secretary Aspin. The chairman of our committee asked for it to be an open hearing. The chairman said he would only come before us in a closed session, yet there was not one piece of information in that hearing that was classified. He just did not want to answer the tough questions that we were asking him and the parents of our young kids are asking us. These questions are being asked all across America.

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD two letters of the parents of young people in my district and in my area, Michael Carroll and William Willoughby, who have questions they have raised about their children's involvement in Somalia.

The letters referred to are as follows:

DREXEL HILL, PA.

October 5, 1993.

DEAR PRESIDENT CLINTON: This letter to you is one small voice that hopes to be heard.

On Sunday, October 3, 1993, at approximately 4 pm we received a call from Staff Sgt. Mackey from the Department of Casualty in Alexandria, VA. At that time, the details were given as follows:

"... Specialist Michael K. Carroll and his unit were on foot attempting to secure a helicopter crash site when he and his unit came under heavy gunfire. Spc. Carroll has received gunshot wounds to his shoulder and is currently at the 507th CFG in Mogadishu. It is not known at this time the severity of his injuries..."

These words echoed in our minds and hearts for the next longest 30 hours of our lives.

During that time, we received a subsequent call from the rear detachment commander, Cpt. Castel from Michael's base in Ft Drum. The only additional information we received was that Michael was in very serious condition and that the wound was to his right shoulder. Additionally, he was awaiting evacuation to Germany for medical treatment once he was stabilized.

As the sun changed Sunday night into Monday morning, we sat awaiting additional

updates. At that point we began our own investigation in search of updates. We were able to contact a military-based hospital in Germany and on parental instinct made the call to the hospital and found that we had reached the correct facility and that the wounded were expected to arrive within the hour. Our next telephone call was made a few hours later and we were advised that Michael had in fact arrived, but they were unable to give us detailed information because they could not properly identify us as next-to-kin. We understood their position and completed the call with respect.

As we began to wait again, you can imagine our surprise and relief, Mr. President when we received a call from Michael personally! Our prayers have been partially answered. We are now anticipating his return to the states for proper medical attention as well as answers to our questions regarding his prognosis.

Experiencing this anguish first hand has pressed our "emotional buttons" to write to you concerning our non-biological sons still remaining in Somalia.

We supported the successful humanitarian relief efforts provided by maybe ten times the American troop strength in December than by what are currently in Mogadishu. As a proud father and former serviceman with the 82nd Airborne, I can say with much pride how much I appreciate the efforts and courage of the American troops in Somalia today. However, it is my feeling after speaking with Michael, and I stress this is my personal feeling, that the military of the United States should do one of two things... withdraw all American troops from Somalia or supply adequate reinforcements to complete the mission so the American troops and people can continue to hold their heads high with pride and respect.

We find it disheartening to hear that when U.S. forces reach out to aid other UN nations in need and require our support, that we get little, if anything, in return from them.

As that former serviceman and proud father, I urge you to either define the mission, complete the mission with adequate troop strength or send our sons home.

Respectfully,

MICHAEL AND STEPHANIE CARROLL.

CLEVELAND TRACK MATERIAL, INC.,

Cleveland, OH, September 24, 1993.

Congressman MARTIN HOKE, Fairview Park, OH.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOKE: This is to inform you about the situation in Somalia. My son John is a platoon leader in the 568th Engineer Company (Combat Support), in Mogadishu and has informed me about his unit involvement. I am disturbed by what appears to be a deteriorating situation in spite of claims to the contrary by U.S. Special Envoy Admiral Jonathan Howe.

My understanding of the situation is from two tours in Vietnam in Special Forces and U.S. combat units, and over a year as an instructor on counter guerrilla operations at the U.S. Army Infantry School, Fort Benning, GA. I was a professional Army officer until medical retirement in 1971.

In Somalia, there are several key indicators of heightened risk and even impending disaster.

1. Popular support is on the side of Aidid. The Pakistanis have particularly earned the enmity of the populace, and the polyglot U.N. forces are regarded as foreigners. The average Somali has to side with his countrymen if he expects to be alive the day after the U.N. forces depart.

2. The gangs have sanctuaries that the U.N. forces do not have the power to control. There are entire sections of Mogadishu that are still under gang dominance.

3. The gangs have freedom of movement to attack U.N. forces at will because of the characteristics of the city and help from the populace. Additionally, practically every street is an ambush site resulting from the narrowness of most streets and walls next to the streets. Conventional forces are exceedingly vulnerable in these circumstances even if they are armed. My son and four of his soldiers luckily survived an ambush on June 5th that was set up in similar conditions. Four U.S. soldiers have been wounded since June 5th and we are very lucky that the casualty numbers are not significantly greater. All of the U.S. casualties are support, not combat troops, by the way.

4. The gangs are better armed. They are using rocket propelled grenades (RPG's) with impunity to attack the U.S. compounds and even holed a U.S. tanker in the harbor on Saturday. They are also improving their military skills such as marksmanship, tactics, and coordination.

The situation is rapidly developing into urban guerrilla warfare against U.N. forces. U.S. forces in this situation are increasingly vulnerable.

1. The combat support and service units (transportation, engineers, medical, etc.) are thin-skinned and not really trained for this type of activity. Fifteen percent of the troops are female, and one trucking company commander is female. The engineer company is equipped with the same machinery as your average county road maintenance crew—bulldozers, loaders, scrapers, and the like—only the operators are U.S. Army soldiers and carry M-16's. They have no heavy weapons—mortars, .50 Cal. machine guns, night vision devices, TOW missiles, and, of course, no Combat Engineer vehicle (CEV's) for the combat engineer missions which they now perform exclusively. In any engagement with the gangs, they are outgunned at the onset.

2. U.N. security is unreliable. One unit was on a large search mission in support of the Pakistanis. In the afternoon, the Pakistanis disappeared—leaving the engineers naked—without security. This is not a confidence builder. Army doctrine and practice until now have proscribed operations combining multi-lingual units below battalion level because of operating difficulties.

3. There are increasing rocket and sniper attacks on the compounds. The rockets (RPG's) are very effective anti-personnel weapons and act like mortars in this application. Our units are especially vulnerable to this type of attack. Car bomb and ground assaults may follow.

4. The U.S. combat unit in the area is a brigade from the 10th Mountain Division which is the U.N. quick reaction force. It is not used to secure any missions by the engineers or transportation units. Please note that it is light infantry also—no tanks or armored personnel carriers.

It is clear that the current forces on the ground are increasingly losing control. It is an obvious lack of combat power defined by quality of forces, communications, mobility, and firepower. A combat power ratio of 3 to 1 is usually required for a conventional force to defeat another conventional force. A combat power ratio of at least 10 to 1 is needed for a conventional force to defeat a guerrilla force. We are not close to that.

The threat of another Beirut-type disaster is real. We must decide to control the situation by re-inserting significant numbers of

U.S. forces. In order to maintain control, those forces may be required to stay there for years. Overwhelming force was a key to success in Desert Storm.

The other alternative is to leave. We must decide to do one or the other. We should not leave any of our forces out on a limb with inadequate security. Casualties will continue to mount. Not one single American soldier's life should be wasted on a situation that has no real mission or any linkage to our national interest.

I look forward to your response.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM H. WILLOUGHBY,

President.

Madam Speaker, I will read part of a letter I got over the fax today from the father of a young man who was in the Somalia operation:

I ask this Congress to put as much effort into investigating this foreign policy disaster, as they put into investigating Watergate, and Iran-Contra. Now if I am not mistaken, neither Watergate nor Iran-Contra caused the loss of American soldiers' lives.

My son Dominick was killed October 3, 1993. He was buried October 11, 1993. He died in Somalia defending his fellow Rangers and fighting for his country's policies. He believed in the Ranger creed, which says: "Never shall I fail my comrades * * * embarrass my country."

Madam Speaker, we cannot embarrass this country, either. This issue needs to be debated.

Madam Speaker, our mission is complete. I was just in Somalia in January. I am convinced we did our job well. I am proud of our troops. We cannot bring home part of them or most of them and leave 4,500 troops there as sitting ducks. It is time to bring them all back home.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues today, this is the first day that we can file a discharge petition that forces a vote on bringing the troops home. I ask my colleagues to sign House Resolution 227 offered by the gentleman from Ohio, SHERROD BROWN. Members can sign it in the well today, which would force an immediate vote on the issue on this House floor of bringing our troops home.

□ 1840

If you are really committed to ending our involvement, you have that opportunity. So I would ask my colleagues on both the Republican side and the Democratic side to support the discharge petition requesting that House Resolution 227 be brought up for immediate consideration. Let us bring our troops home now.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has spoken on the continued deployment of American troops in Somalia. After 2 days of intense pressure by the Senate leadership, Senator BYRD backed off his original amendment to an early withdrawal, and the Senate agreed to authorize United States troops in Somalia until the March 31 deadline requested by the President. But our troops remain under fire, and the House has an equal responsibility to address this issue. I am outraged that we are being denied that opportunity. Months after our

troops have completed their mission, there is no legitimate reason to postpone this debate one more day. Michael Durant has been returned to the United States, and we have accounted for those who were killed. It is time to bring the troops home.

Many months ago, U.S. troops achieved their objectives as outlined by President Bush. Key transportation routes were secured and the food was flowing to the Somali people. By February, we put an end to the mass starvation in that nation. Under the plan put forward by the Bush administration, our troops were to leave once those objectives were achieved and control of the operation was to be transferred to a U.N. peacekeeping force.

In March, however, the U.N. Security Council expanded the size and mandate of the original mission. The new administration allowed them to remain involved under the guise of a nation-building effort. What started out as a rapid intervention mission has been stretched into a protracted crisis. And, my colleagues, I regret to say that it got our stamp of approval. On May 25, over the objections of many in this body including myself, the House authorized the continued deployment of U.S. troops for the U.N.'s peacekeeping mission.

We had no business authorizing an open-ended deployment for troops in Somalia before the President even explained the mission and asked the American people and Congress to support it. Yet, that is exactly what the House did. When our worst fears were realized, the House called for a vote by November 15 on the continued deployment of troops in Somalia. So far, that has not been forthcoming. It now appears we will simply be asked to consider the language the Senate approved when we debate the Defense appropriations conference report.

Many of us argued in May that we should bring the troops home no later than June 30. That was not unreasonable, our mission had long been completed and the transfer to U.N. command had occurred on May 1. But that measure was defeated. So we supported a substitute which would have allowed 6 months to bring the troops home. And that was defeated. Five months later, our troops remain, and as many of us predicted in May, we have become mired in this civil conflict and suffered needless casualties.

We said in May that it was time to bring United States military involvement in Somalia to an end, and we are saying it even more emphatically today. Every day our troops remain in Somalia, they are becoming more deeply entrenched in this civil war and needlessly risking their lives. According to a New York Times reporter in Mogadishu last week, "The Sprawling, sandy compound that houses thousands of United States forces is still a base besieged, with all but a few troops forbidden to leave the shelter of sandbags and coiled concertina wire to patrol Somali streets * * * snipers opened fire overnight Monday on two strongpoints held by Pakistani peacekeeping troops."

How much more carnage do we need to witness before we come to our senses? What is it going to take to force us into action? The President has called for a March 31 deadline in Somalia, but we have yet to hear the details of the mission and what will be accomplished.

From every direction in Washington, there are powerful forces at work trying to stall congressional action on this critical matter. Secretary Aspin refuses to appear in a public hearing to explain how the troops were denied equipment, much less to explain our military objectives over the next 6 months. Nobody benefits if we find ourselves back here in a few months saying that we were right once again, and we have lost more lives.

We are ignoring our responsibility to the American people if we let this military mission continue without a full debate and a vote in the House of Representatives. I am frustrated by the leadership's complacency on this issue and am becoming convinced that there is an effort to sweep this issue under the rug. So I am initiating a discharge petition today on House Resolution 227, the resolution urging the President to return troops from Somalia as expeditiously as possible. I urge those who share my concerns to sign on to this petition immediately. With American lives on the line, we cannot afford to be talked into delay. Now is the time for Congress to act and bring the troops home.

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELDON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, I would appreciate it if the gentleman would state for the RECORD, because the gentleman and I serve together on the Armed Services Committee, that it certainly was not this gentleman, nor my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee, who in any way attempted to limit the debate on the options on the issue of Somalia.

Mr. WELDON. No. I said in my comment it was this chairman who requested a full and open hearing today with the Secretary of Defense, and if anything, I applaud the chairman for his willingness to have an open discussion on this issue.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Speaker, our President desperately needs to articulate to the American people our policy in this foreign country.

I attended a briefing this morning, a classified briefing, although there was nothing classified in the briefing, that certainly did not answer my questions nor the questions of the American people, nor did it allay my fears nor their fears.

We are in a no-win situation. This is assured by the March 31, 1994, deadline for pulling out. This is the equivalent of telling your chess opponent what your next move is going to be.

Aideed's route to victory is peace. He can now vacation for 6 months, come back and pick up all of the marbles, or worse yet, he can acutely embarrass us just days before the March 31 pullout. It will cost millions, perhaps billions of

dollars more to keep our troops there this long. And who knows how many American lives will be lost.

The generally good advice to not tie the President's hands in foreign policy implies a level of confidence in our leadership which I do not think now exists. This Congress and the American people really need the debate that is now going on. I am very appreciative of the debate from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, I recognize that my colleagues on the other side have used up all of their time, and in the spirit of comity, although there are a couple of my colleagues who do not agree with us on this side, I am feeling generous, and I, therefore, yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for graciously allowing me this time. This is almost unprecedented, and I want him to know that I appreciate it very much.

Madam Speaker, I was interested in Somalia from the very beginning because I did go to the White House and ask the people when are we going to be out of Somalia when we first went in in December, and they told me well, we are going to try to be out by Inauguration Day, January 20. Well, January 20 came and went and we were still there, and we are still there now.

The reason I asked for this time is because one of the young people that was involved in this firefight was from my congressional district, and his mother called our office. I think it is important for the House to know what transpired, because I had mentioned that I will do everything I can for her, like any other Congressman here would. But I said, "Well, why don't you call the White House?"

When she called the White House she was most irate when she got back to me, because the White House talked to her. First of all, they had her on the phone for 4 minutes waiting. When they got on the line, they had a recorded message on health care. And then when they finally talked to her, she told them of her concerns, and why she was calling, and they at the White House said, "Well, we'll make sure the President hears of your comments." She said, "Well, do you want my name or my son's name or background?" And they said no, "We're not interested in that. We'll just add you to the list of people who are opposed to our policy in Somalia."

I do not think that that is a way that our Government should treat the parents of the sons that we have overseas. So not only do we have an obligation here in this body to make sure that our people in uniform are protected, but we have got to, I think, have some sensitivity and some feeling for the people who have their sons and daughters in

the service. And that is not always being exemplified. And that is why people are so negative and turned off on this Government.

Again I appreciate the gentleman from California giving me these 2 minutes. It was very generous, and I want him to know I appreciate it.

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for supporting the fundamental issue of the right to debate this issue. And I know he has always done that.

But the important thing is that the House be allowed to debate it just like in the Byrd-Dole debate, because if this thing comes to conference, and we have not debated the issue, then I think it is a shirking of our responsibility.

But I believe we need to pull out of Somalia now. In this Member's opinion, the Gephardt amendment for sanctions during Desert Storm was in poor judgment. I think the Gephardt amendment to stay in Somalia is also in poor judgment.

Aideed, whether he fires a shot or not, or another bandit takes his place, or they take out Aideed, he is still going to be there 6 months from now. We are going to risk lives, and it is going to continue to cost American dollars.

Let me tell Members the way in which I think we are irresponsible. One Member said cheap shots.

On August 8 we lost a light armored vehicle, destroyed lives. The military commanders on the line, seeing they could not get to our troops, requested that they have heavy armor.

On 25 September we lost a helicopter, not talked about much. Two people escaped. One torso was cut in half by the Somalis. They tore apart the arms and legs and paraded through the streets. They are not the Aideed supporters. These are civilians. And again we asked for armor. The Secretary of Defense turned down that request for that armor.

On October 3 we lost 2 helicopters, 18 killed, we had 72 wounded. Why? It took 7 hours for U.N. forces to get to them. That is our policy of putting our troops under U.N. control. The Pakistanis, the Malaysians did not speak English. They had to use night goggles. In the first intersection they were hit.

We got our donkeys kicked there and they were hit. If we would have had that armor, we could have rolled right through those barricades, got to our helicopters, and maybe not lost as many people.

Let us get out of Somalia.

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Madam Speaker, let me say that the debate on Somalia will come in November, and we are going to hear it all of the time in 1-minute speeches. But I will tell you, this afternoon I was talking to a friend back in Columbus, an associate with the Mershon Center, a think tank, and we both began to think about the talk that Cap Weinberger made in 1984 to the National Press Club. Cap Weinberger said there are six conditions that ought to be met before we decide whether we are going to commit U.S. forces.

Condition No. 1, our vital interests must be at stake. Condition No. 2, the issues involved are so important for the future of the United States and our allies that we are prepared to commit enough forces to win. No. 3, we have clearly defined the political and military objective which we must secure. Four, we have sized our forces to achieve our objectives. Five, we have some reasonable assurance of the support of the American people, including the People's House. And six, U.S. forces are committed to combat only as a last resort.

What I maintain has been happening in this country, and it happened when Ronald Reagan put us in Lebanon, and I feel compelled today to say that when that vote came up to keep our forces in Lebanon, I voted against the administration, against Ronald Reagan, because I thought our mission in Lebanon did not make a lot of sense.

□ 1850

I also sent a letter to President Clinton earlier this year when he struggled with the decision on Bosnia and I said in that letter:

Mr. President, I want to be constructive. If you have a clear plan for going to Bosnia, if it makes sense I want to be bipartisan.

My statement today is designed to say that in foreign policy we have to be bipartisan but it is also designed to say that I think Cap Weinberger really hit on something in these six principles that we ought to dig out again. And when we look at Lebanon or when we look at Somalia or when we look at Haiti we begin to find that those particular circumstances do not really get answered in the six precepts that Cap Weinberger laid out. That is why we have been losing our way in terms of defining foreign policy. And we had better learn from these cases as we begin to look at places like Bosnia. We have got to be able to decide "Are our vital interests at stake? Are we prepared to commit enough forces? Do we have clearly defined political and military objectives? Have we sized our force right? Do we have the support of the American people and the Members of this body? And are U.S. forces committed to combat only as a last resort?" And I believe that if the circumstances that we are looking at around the world cannot be answered

by looking at these vital precepts that Cap Weinberger laid down for us then I think we draw the conclusion that we ought not to go.

I think that is what happened in this administration. We have not been able to clearly define these objectives.

Mr. Chairman, I think what I am going to do is make sure we send out a "Dear Colleague" on this issue of what Weinberger raised for all of us to think about because the debate on Somalia is going to continue here but it is really a much larger debate about the future of the American forces in the post cold war.

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

My colleagues, I am going to do a special order tonight for an hour because I was in Somalia yesterday, flew all last night and got home at about 4 o'clock in the morning and flew over and back on the air bridge, four C-5 flights, two of them for 12 hours and 13 hours each, two for 5 hours each from West Cairo down to Mogadishu.

When I arrived at the airport there was an H-60 waiting for me with General Thomas Montgomery at the airplane. He put me on the H-60 and within 5 minutes I am looking down at 10 Soviet-built T-72 tanks, painted white, and an Indian flag flying over their detachment area.

I said, "General, tell me these just got here. They weren't here October 3." He said, "I know what you are saying, Congressman, but they were here. I called the Indians; I asked them for help. It was the dead of night and they had to call Delhi."

"I called the Italians and I asked them for help. They had to call Rome. And the result was," and all these are allies and they wanted to help—"it was a political breakdown." The rescue mission was 9 hours getting to site 2 where five Americans were probably taken alive and beaten to death by the crowd. One of them did have white plastic handcuffs that had been cut. As I said on this floor several times last week no one puts handcuffs on a dead body.

So where do we go from here? I am looking at Clinton's press statements out of Dee Dee Myers, that he is pulling out the Rangers.

I ask my colleagues, I ask America, I ask a million people watching this House floor right now: Why are we announcing that the Rangers are leaving? If they want to bring them home, bring them home, but do not announce it. As we speak Aideed is having a press conference and pointing out that he killed five men from the 160th Special Ops Aviation Regiment, that he killed six men from Benning, one of them with that mortar fire. If we are out of time that is all right. I will continue with a

full hour this afternoon. There is a lot my colleagues have to know about the Somalia operation implications on Haiti and Bosnia.

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Madam Speaker, I spent last weekend in Fort Benning, GA. On Friday night I read reports in the Bayonet paper, which is the post paper, about the memorial service for six Rangers who were killed in Somalia, reports of those who were wounded in Somalia, and a blow-by-blow article from a troop engaged in hand-to-hand combat, fighting for 16 hours he was pinned down.

Then on Saturday morning I visited Michael Collins, sergeant, Birmingham, AL, wounded in the gunfight in Somalia, is going to be laid up for over a year trying to recuperate.

Then I had lunch with young recruits going through basic training. We talked about Somalia, the possibility of them going to Somalia in a very short period after finishing their basic training. They are prepared to go; if called they will go.

They are concerned, though, which was: Will Congress support us if we go? They did not ask, "Will the President support us?" They asked, "Will Congress support us?"

I talked with career soldiers, soldiers who had been in and remember Vietnam. The morale of those soldiers is low. They are concerned.

I spent time with retirees, with generals, colonels, and they all say we do not need to be in Somalia. Somalia has the makings of another Vietnam. Bring our troops home. But on the way out kick Mr. Aideed right square in the rump.

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON].

Mr. WASHINGTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for yielding this time to me and especially for giving me the honor of closing debate on what is an important subject and will become an even more important subject in the days and weeks ahead.

Madam Speaker, I come to the well this evening to set the record straight, however, because I have heard over and over again from some of our friends who wish to quarrel with the President's policy but do not have the courage to run for President in order to hold that office, that we have no legitimate interest in Somalia.

I have searched the RECORD and many of these same Members were Members of Congress during the period of time when they thought that they had some significant military interest in Somalia, because between 1980 and

1988 this country appropriated and gave \$140 million in military aid to Somalia. We had a military interest then; but the only difference is that the Soviet Union does not exist anymore.

Some of you people act like you just heard of Somalia when you saw the dying people on television back in November and December last year. You know better than that. You have known where Somalia was all along. You participated and propped up the Marxist regime because you wanted to do something to try to fight the Soviets being in Ethiopia. So you used the puppet of Somalia to try to balance off what you thought was happening in the Soviet Union and now you want to come with clean hands and say you do not know where Somalia is?

Pontius Pilate was not guilty of the death of Jesus Christ, but he was not innocent. And we are not guilty of what is going on in Somalia but we damned sure as hell are not innocent. We participated by sending money and military aid and propping up the Government in Somalia. Now my colleagues, both Democrat and Republican, want to say we have no legitimate interest in Somalia? We are responsible because every colonialist is responsible for neo-colonialism. This is the same kind of colonialism that the British and the Italians practiced up until 1960 when they supposedly set Somalia free.

From 1960 until now our hands are dirty, and if our children die over there, it is the fault of people who appropriated the money to prop up the regime with \$140 million to those many years, and that is the truth.

□ 1900

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM JOHNSON].

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I do not think colonialism is the issue, in deference to my friend. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON] is a good guy, and I appreciate that he is from a good State; but colonialism just is not the issue.

The issue here is, can we take care of our guys? The mission keeps changing on us. It started off as humanitarian and then it changed to combat. We would not call it that. It was not called combat. It was called a peace action.

When our POW got shot down and caught and when those other guys got dragged through the streets and killed by those Somalis, we did not want to call them POW's. We did not call them missing-in-action. We did not call them killed in action.

Do you know what that POW was called? He was called a detainee. That is because some general counsel in the Department of Defense said that is what he would be called.

Secretary Aspin said, "Let's try to figure out what kind of rules we are going to follow."

Let me tell you, there are the rules of combat, which is the Geneva Convention on POW care, that can be followed and should have been followed and were not followed.

So what is the issue here? Our administration cannot take care of our people in Somalia. They do not know what the mission is. They do not know how to conduct the mission, the mission being nonexistent with no goal and no opportunity to retrieve our people in good health.

Therefore, what is the answer? The obvious answer is let us get ourselves out of there.

What in the world are we protecting, the United States or the United Nations? I do not think our job is to protect the United Nations. It is to protect the United States of America, and that means withdrawal from Somalia.

Mr. SPENCE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Madam Speaker, as evidenced by the remarks on the floor this afternoon, for the most part I do not think this has been a partisan debate, nor should it be. We find ourselves in this place today because as some have expressed it, we have been through a learning experience.

Our chairman suggested that we are in a post-cold-war environment. The same old rules do not apply. We are feeling our way. We are groping. That may be so, and to some extent that is so; but if nothing else comes out of this debate, and I hope we will have more debate before the time is over this year, before November 15. The other body, as I said, has already debated this issue more in depth than we have. If we have learned nothing else, we have learned that we have made a mistake in Somalia.

The U.N. policy was wrong. We supported that policy and we have now admitted it, in due deference to our President, as expressed by the chairman of our committee today.

He has admitted that mistake, and we are now on the right track, it seems to me. We have at least admitted our mistake. We are in the process of pulling out militarily from Somalia.

Maybe with all the bad things we have gone through, and yes, even though we have lost lives in the process, maybe we have learned something for the future, that will serve us well when we consider these kinds of problems in the future, and we will be considering these kinds of problems in the future.

We have learned that we should not be involved, I repeat, in the internal affairs of other people. We have enough to do right here at home.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KENNELLY). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

The motion to instruct was agreed to.

MOTION TO CLOSE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE MEETINGS ON H.R. 2401

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to rule XXVIII, clause 6(a), I move that conference committee meetings on the bill (H.R. 2401) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, be closed to the public at such times as classified national security information is under consideration, provided, however, that any sitting Member of Congress shall have the right to attend any closed or open meeting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6, rule XXVIII, the vote on this motion will be taken by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 2, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 516]

YEAS—422

Abercrombie	Byrne	Dreier
Ackerman	Callahan	Duncan
Allard	Calvert	Dunn
Andrews (ME)	Camp	Durbin
Andrews (TX)	Canady	Edwards (CA)
Applegate	Cantwell	Edwards (TX)
Archer	Cardin	Emerson
Army	Carr	English (AZ)
Bacchus (FL)	Castle	English (OK)
Bachus (AL)	Clay	Eshoo
Baessler	Clayton	Evans
Baker (CA)	Clement	Everett
Baker (LA)	Clinger	Ewing
Ballenger	Clyburn	Farr
Barca	Coble	Fawell
Barcia	Coleman	Fazio
Barlow	Collins (GA)	Fields (LA)
Barrett (NE)	Collins (IL)	Fields (TX)
Barrett (WI)	Collins (MI)	Filner
Bartlett	Combest	Fingerhut
Barton	Condit	Fish
Bateman	Conyers	Flake
Becerra	Cooper	Foglietta
Beilenson	Coppersmith	Ford (MI)
Bentley	Costello	Ford (TN)
Bereuter	Cox	Fowler
Berman	Coyne	Frank (MA)
Bevill	Cramer	Franks (CT)
Bilbray	Crane	Franks (NJ)
Bilirakis	Crapo	Frost
Bishop	Cunningham	Furse
Blackwell	Danner	Galleghy
Blute	Darden	Gallo
Boehlert	de la Garza	Gedensson
Boehner	Deal	Gekas
Bonilla	DeLauro	Gephardt
Bonior	DeLay	Geren
Boucher	Dellums	Gibbons
Brewster	Derrick	Gilchrest
Brooks	Deutsch	Gillmor
Browder	Diaz-Balart	Gilman
Brown (CA)	Dickey	Gingrich
Brown (FL)	Dicks	Glickman
Brown (OH)	Dingell	Gonzalez
Bryant	Dixon	Goodlatte
Bunning	Dooley	Goodling
Burton	Doolittle	Gordon
Buyer	Dorman	Goss

Grams	Martinez	Royce
Grandy	Matsui	Rush
Green	Mazzoli	Sabo
Gunderson	McCandless	Sanders
Gutierrez	McCloskey	Sangmeister
Hall (OH)	McCollum	Sarpaliss
Hall (TX)	McCrery	Sawyer
Hamburg	McCurdy	Saxton
Hamilton	McDade	Schaefer
Hancock	McDermott	Schenk
Harman	McHale	Schiff
Hastert	McHugh	Schroeder
Hastings	McInnis	Schumer
Hayes	McKeon	Scott
Hefloy	McKinney	Sensenbrenner
Hefner	McMillan	Serrano
Herger	McNulty	Sharp
Hilliard	Meehan	Shaw
Hinchey	Meek	Shays
Hoagland	Menendez	Shepherd
Hobson	Meyers	Shuster
Hochbrueckner	Mfume	Sisisky
Hoekstra	Mica	Skaggs
Hoke	Michel	Skeen
Holden	Miller (CA)	Skelton
Horn	Miller (FL)	Slattery
Houghton	Mineta	Slaughter
Hoyer	Minge	Smith (IA)
Huffington	Mink	Smith (MI)
Hughes	Moakley	Smith (NJ)
Hunter	Mollinari	Smith (OR)
Hutchinson	Mollohan	Smith (TX)
Hutto	Montgomery	Snowe
Hyde	Moorhead	Solomon
Inglis	Moran	Spence
Inhofe	Morella	Spratt
Inslee	Murphy	Stark
Istook	Murtha	Stearns
Jacobs	Myers	Stenholm
Jefferson	Nadler	Stokes
Johnson (CT)	Natcher	Strickland
Johnson (GA)	Neal (MA)	Studds
Johnson (SD)	Nussle	Stump
Johnson, E. B.	Oberstar	Stupak
Johnston	Obey	Sundquist
Kanjorski	Oliver	Swett
Kaptur	Ortiz	Swift
Kasich	Orton	Synar
Kennedy	Owens	Talent
Kennelly	Oxley	Tanner
Kildee	Packard	Tauzin
Kim	Pallone	Taylor (MS)
King	Parker	Taylor (NC)
Kingston	Pastor	Tejeda
Kleczka	Paxon	Thomas (CA)
Klein	Payne (NJ)	Thomas (WY)
Klink	Payne (VA)	Thompson
Klug	Pelosi	Thornton
Knollenberg	Penny	Thurman
Kolbe	Peterson (FL)	Torkildsen
Kopetski	Peterson (MN)	Torres
Kreidler	Petri	Torricelli
Kyl	Pickett	Towns
LaFalce	Pickle	Trafficant
Lambert	Pombo	Tucker
Lancaster	Pomeroy	Unsoeld
Lantos	Porter	Upton
LaRocco	Portman	Valentine
Lazio	Poshard	Velazquez
Laughlin	Price (NC)	Vento
Leach	Pryce (OH)	Visclosky
Lehman	Quillen	Volkmer
Levin	Quinn	Vucanovich
Levy	Rahall	Walker
Lewis (CA)	Ramstad	Walsh
Lewis (FL)	Rangel	Waters
Lewis (GA)	Ravenel	Watt
Lightfoot	Reed	Waxman
Linder	Regula	Weldon
Lipinski	Reynolds	Wheat
Livingston	Richardson	Whitten
Lloyd	Ridge	Williams
Long	Roberts	Wilson
Lowe	Roemer	Wise
Machtley	Rogers	Wolf
Maloney	Rohrabacher	Woolsey
Mann	Ros-Lehtinen	Wyden
Manton	Rose	Wynn
Manzullo	Rostenkowski	Yates
Margolies	Roth	Young (AK)
Mezvinsky	Roukema	Young (FL)
Markey	Rowland	Zeliff
	Roybal-Allard	Zimmer

NAYS—2

DeFazio

Washington

NOT VOTING—9

Andrews (NJ)
Bliley
Borski

Chapman
Engel
Greenwood

Hansen
Neal (NC)
Santorum

□ 1927

Mr. WASHINGTON changed his vote from "present" to "nay."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on H.R. 2401.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994:

From the Committee on Armed Services, for consideration of the entire House bill and the entire Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Messrs. HUTTO, SKELTON, and MCCURDY, Mrs. LLOYD, Messrs. SISISKY, SPRATT, MCCLOSKEY, ORTIZ, HOCHBRUECKNER, TAYLOR of Mississippi, ABERCROMBIE, ANDREWS of Maine, EDWARDS of Texas, and UNDERWOOD, Ms. HARMAN, and Messrs. SPENCE, STUMP, HUNTER, KASICH, BATEMAN, HANSEN, WELDON, KYL, RAVENEL, DORNAN, HEFLEY, and MACHTLEY.

As additional conferees from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for consideration of matters within the jurisdiction of that committee under clause 2 of rule XLVIII: Messrs. GLICKMAN, RICHARDSON, and COMBEST.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, for consideration of sections 812, and 1316 of the House bill and sections 1087, 2854, and 2908 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. GONZALEZ, NEAL of North Carolina, and KANJORSKI, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. RIDGE.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Education and Labor, for consideration of sections 373, 1303, 1331, 1333-1337, 1343, 1344, and 3103 of the House bill and sections 338, 532, 1088, and 2853 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. FORD of Michigan, CLAY, WILLIAMS, PETRI, and GOODLING.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Energy and Commerce,

for consideration of sections 267, 382, 601, 1109, 1314, 2816, 2822, 2829, 2830, 2839, 3105(b) and (c), 3132, 3137, 3140, and 3201 of the House bill and sections 322, 325, 327, 705, 822, 1088, 2802, 2803, 2833, 2842, 2844, 2913, 3106(c), (d), (j), (l), 3131, 3132, 3133, 3136-3147, 3149, 3150, 3201, and 3202 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. DINGELL, SHARP, SWIFT, MOORHEAD, and OXLEY.

Provided, Mr. BLILEY is appointed in lieu of Mr. OXLEY solely for the consideration of sections 267, 601, and 1109 of the House bill, and sections 705 and 3106 of the Senate amendment.

Provided, Mr. BILIRAKIS is appointed in lieu of Mr. OXLEY solely for the consideration of sections 1314, 3137, 3140, and 3201 of the House bill, and sections 322, 2802, 2803, 3132, 3136, 3139-3147, 3149, 3150, 3201, and 3202 of the Senate amendment.

Provided, Mr. STEARNS is appointed in lieu of Mr. OXLEY and Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois is appointed in lieu of Mr. SWIFT solely for the consideration of section 822 of the Senate amendment.

Provided, Mr. SCHAEFER is appointed in lieu of Mr. OXLEY solely for the consideration of section 3138 of the Senate amendment.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of sections 234, 237, 241, 1005, 1008 (relating to funding structure for contingency operations), 1009 (relating to report on humanitarian assistance activities), 1021, 1022, 1034, 1038, 1041, 1043-1045, 1048, 1051-1055, 1105, 1107, 1108, 1201-1203, 1205-1208, 1360, 1501-1510, and 3136 of the House bill and sections 216, 221, 223, 224, 241-245, 547, 1041, 1042, 1051-1054, 1061, 1067, 1077, 1078, 1083-1085, 1087, 1093, 1094, 1101-1103 and 1105-1107 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. HAMILTON, GEJDENSON, LANTOS, GILMAN, and GOODLING.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Government Operations, for consideration of sections 818, 829, 1023, 1050, 2816, 2821, 2823, 2839, and 3140 of the House bill and sections 825, 2843, 2844, and 2902-2908 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Messrs. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, CLINGER, and MCCANDLESS.

As additional conferees from the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of section 262 of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BROOKS, SYNAR, BERMAN, FISH, and MOORHEAD.

As additional conferees from the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of section 1022 of the House bill and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BROOKS, SCHUMER, CONYERS, SENSENBRENNER, and FISH.

As additional conferees from the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of section 1082 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BROOKS,

MAZZOLI, BRYANT, FISH, and MCCOLLUM.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, for the consideration of sections 1351, 1352, and 1354-1359 of the House bill and sections 654 and 3501-3506 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. STUDDS, TAUZIN, LIPINSKI, FIELDS of Texas, and BATEMAN.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, for consideration of sections 265, 1314, and 3137 of the House bill and sections 328, 2841, 2851, 2915, 3103, and 3135 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. STUDDS, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Messrs. REED, FIELDS of Texas, and BATEMAN.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Natural Resources, for consideration of section 2818 of the House bill and sections 2855, 3132, 3139, and 3147 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. MILLER of California, VENTO, LEHMAN, and YOUNG of Alaska, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, for consideration of sections 364, 901, 934, 943, and 1408 of the House bill and sections 523, 1064, and 3504 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. CLAY, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, and Mrs. MORELLA.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, for consideration of sections 2816 and 2841 of the House bill and sections 1063, 1087, 2833, 2842, and 2917 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. MINETA, APPLIGATE, WISE, SHUSTER, and CLINGER.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Rules, for consideration of section 1008 (relating to funding structure for contingency operations) of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. DERRICK, BEILSON, FROST, SOLOMON, and QUILLLEN.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for consideration of sections 215, 262, 265, 1303, 1304, 1312-1318, and 3105 of the House bill and sections 203, 233, 235, 803, and 3141-3148 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. VALENTINE, Ms. E.B. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. FAWELL.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Small Business, for consideration of section 829 of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for

consideration of sections 1071 and 1079 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. MONTGOMERY, SANGMEISTER, and STUMP. Provided, Mr. SLATTERY is appointed in lieu of Mr. SANGMEISTER solely for the consideration of section 1079.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of sections 653, 705, and 1087 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ROSTENKOWSKI, GIBBONS, PICKLE, ARCHER, and CRANE.

There was no objection.

□ 1930

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2519, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2519) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Thursday, October 14, 1993, at page H7968.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report and the amendments in disagreement on H.R. 2519, the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 1994, and that I be permitted to insert a table and extraneous matter following my remarks on the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

□ 1940

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will only take about 1 minute. This conference report has

been available for the Members for 5 days. I think most everybody knows what is in the report. I will just summarize very briefly.

The total amount of money for budget authority is \$23,396,781,000. Of that, \$3.8 billion is to continue various programs for technology enhancement, economic development incentives, scientific research, fisheries development, weather forecasting services, international trade and tourism promotion, and for small business development.

There is \$10.1 billion in discretionary appropriations for the Department of Justice and the law enforcement agencies. The conference report also includes \$2.7 plus billion for the judiciary. The conference agreement also includes funding for related agencies such as, \$374.4 million for the Maritime Administration, \$400 million for the Legal Services Corporation, \$657 million for the Small Business Administration, and \$1.142 billion for the U.S. Information Agency.

Mr. Speaker, 178 amendments were added to the bill when it went to the Senate. We have been able to resolve all of these. I think there is only one upon which we will probably have a vote. It is my hope that that is the case.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 17 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I hope not to take that entire time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2519, the fiscal year 1994 Departments of Commerce, Justice, State, the judiciary, and related agencies appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, the chairmen of the House-Senate conference committee, and all the members of the conference committee, are to be commended for their diligence in crafting a conference report which I believe all Members should support.

Under the leadership of the chairmen of the conference committee—the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from South Carolina—and with the help of a revised 602(b) allocation, the conferees were able to make some important improvements over the House-passed bill, particularly in high priority areas such as law enforcement, and immigration controls. In addition, the conferees have placed controls on U.N. peacekeeping.

For the Department of Justice, an area of particular concern to many Members of this body, the conference agreement provides a \$130 million increase over the House-passed bill. A sizable portion of this increase finances a comprehensive immigration initiative which will allow us not only to detect and apprehend, but also to detain and deport, illegal aliens. The conference report provides a \$90 million increase over the House-passed bill for

immigration control initiatives, a \$129 million increase over fiscal year 1993. Not only does the agreement put 600 additional border patrol agents in the field as provided in the House bill, it also funds construction and expansion of four INS detention facilities, and increased detention and deportation facilities at airports and seaports, items which were not included in the House-passed bill.

To fight the war on crime and drugs, the conference agreement provides funds above the House level for the FBI, the DEA, and for assistance grants for State and local law enforcement.

For the Commerce Department, the conference report provides increases above the House for the administration's technology initiatives. We increase funding by 16 percent above the House to continue National Weather Service modernization efforts. Funds are also provided for the Economic Development Administration to help assist communities impacted by defense and timber industry cutbacks, as well as other economically depressed communities.

Like the House-passed bill, the judiciary is given a significant increase, 11 percent, over fiscal year 1993, including full funding for the 35 new bankruptcy judgeships the Congress approved last year.

Reflecting the need to put our own domestic needs first, we have cut spending for the Department of State and international programs 8 percent below the fiscal 1993 level, a \$349 million cut.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report the conferees were able to reach a compromise once and for all on the issue of funding Radio and TV Marti. Under the conference agreement, Radio and TV Marti have one last chance to prove their effectiveness—if it cannot be proven, they will be terminated.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement sends a strong signal to the administration and to the American public on what I believe to be one of the most important issues facing our nation today—the role of the United Nations in our national security policy.

When we brought this bill to the House 4 months ago, we had a record high of 13 peacekeeping operations. Now, we have 18 missions, with 3 new missions having been approved in the last 2 months. And the U.S. bill for these operations now totals \$1.3 billion for fiscal 1994 alone.

More importantly, in the last 4 months too many brave American soldiers are being placed in harm's way, too many are paying with their lives. The United States now has almost 50,000 Americans soldiers supporting U.N. missions around the globe. And, the President wants to send as many as 25,000 more to Bosnia.

Why are they there? What vital U.S. interests are at stake? When are they coming home? And, what is the cost to the American taxpayer?

Unbelievably, not even the administration has answered these questions.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to step up to the plate. It is high time the administration told the American people what our role is in the morass of U.N. nation building.

And, the Congress must demand answers.

This conference report is a step in the right direction. It includes strong language putting the administration on notice that the American public has not bought into this notion of global peacekeeping. The conference report tells the administration that we expect:

The Secretary of State to notify the Congress at least 15 days in advance before our U.S. Representative votes at the United Nations for any new peacekeeping missions. The President must tell us the cost, the mission, the U.S. interests served, the duration and the termination date, and the source of funding.

We recommend the administration not agree to any new missions until both the administration and the United Nations clean up their act.

We expect the administration to notify the United Nations that the United States will not pay more than a 25 percent assessment for peacekeeping.

The conferees are putting the United Nations on notice that we are tired of no one minding the store, and it is high time for a strong, independent inspector general who will put an end to the endless reports of waste, fraud, and abuse at the United Nations. The conference report puts into law a requirement that the United States withhold 10 percent of all regular United Nations budget contributions until the Secretary of State can certify to the Congress that the United Nations has a strong inspector general.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report puts the administration on notice that the Congress, and the American people, are watching, and expect to be consulted on these gravely important matters.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I believe the conferees have done a tremendous job balancing pressing domestic priorities with the fiscal constraints we are operating under.

Mr. Speaker, I have placed on the platform here a map showing the 18 so-called peacekeeping missions in which the United Nations is now involved around the world. As I said, just a few months ago there were only 13 of these. In the last 2 months we have become engaged in two or three more by the vote of our delegate to the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we brought some order, brought some discipline into the decision of when we go into a peacekeeping operation, how we pay

for it, how the mission is defined, when we get out, and under what conditions.

I believe this procedure, that is in this conference report, does just that. It does not, in my judgment, violate any of the separation of powers clauses, nor the War Powers Act, because these are United Nations proceedings, not otherwise.

□ 1950

And I hope and trust that the conference report will be accepted.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and more important, I want to thank the gentleman for his real leadership in addressing some very, very crucial issues in regard to our Nation's relationship with the United Nations today, and the related concern that he has talked about that I think all of us have in the Congress in regards to the need for a rational foreign policy.

I was with the gentleman during the now, I guess, maybe, infamous so-called briefing on Somalia where more questions were raised than answered, and now we have very similar concerns in regard to Bosnia and Haiti. And I want to thank the gentleman for what he is trying to accomplish within this bill. It is most important, and I urge all of the Members to pay attention.

I think the gentleman has said, if I am correct, that the United Nations is currently involved in 18 peacekeeping missions, with 8 more being proposed, and that some 50,000 American troops are directly or indirectly involved. Is this the case?

Mr. ROGERS. That is exactly correct.

Mr. ROBERTS. I must tell the gentleman even with the press attention to this matter I do not think the American people are aware of the extent of that involvement.

The gentleman addressed this problem, if I heard him correctly, by requiring the United Nations to give 15 days' notice before any peacekeeping involvement, including cost, including the purpose of the mission and some kind of date or some kind of time equation so we know where we are, is this the case?

Mr. ROGERS. That is correct. The procedure now is, there is no congressional deliberation of a decision that our U.N. representative makes at the Security Council in New York about a possible mission that they would like to get involved with. The Security Council votes to go into that mission, wherever it may be, and we are bound by it. Then the United Nations sends us a bill, sends the Congress a bill for almost one-third of the total cost of that peacekeeping operation.

Mr. ROBERTS. Let me ask a question about that, because as the gentleman indicated, I understand the

United Nations assesses the United States about 32 percent, I think it is about 31.9 percent of the total cost of each of the peacekeeping missions. Now am I to understand that assessment has been raised or increased, and that, according to my figures here, and we talked about this, that estimated requirement in 1994 comes to \$1.4 billion, and that involves a shortfall of \$855 million. Is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS. That is correct. The total cost of the requirements in 1994 for peacekeeping missions by the United Nations, our share of that, is \$1.3 billion, and we were unable to pay it. We simply cannot pay that figure, and we are not paying it in this bill.

Meanwhile, they are voting more missions that we cannot pay for, and we have to get a handle on the fiscal end of this problem, if nothing more. And that is what this conference report attempts to do.

Mr. ROBERTS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, to address the problem in this bill the gentleman is saying to our State Department, in keeping with the President's desire, I might add, for more involvement by other countries, that the State Department tell the United Nations that our cost share of the bill would be 25 percent in the future, is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS. That is correct. The conferees expect the administration to notify the United Nations that the United States will not accept an assessment greater than 25 percent. Currently, the United Nations charges the United States 31.7 percent. We are saying that is unacceptable. We expect our assessment to be no more than 25 percent, the same percentage we contribute to the general budget of the United Nations. I believe it is too much as it is at 25 percent. But at least we ought to hold the peacekeeping assessment to 25 percent as well.

Mr. ROBERTS. Finally, I believe you said that the United States would withdraw 10 percent of its funding if the United Nations does not appoint a long-needed inspector general to conduct an investigation with regards to fraud, and waste, and abuse, is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTS. That is exactly right. For years the United States under different administrations has been pressuring the United Nations to appoint some sort of independent auditor to root out waste, fraud, and abuse. They have refused any meaningful attempts at reform.

Now we are saying in this conference report OK, if that is the way you want it, we are going to withhold a portion of our annual dues to the United Nations. We are going to withhold 10 percent until the Secretary of State certifies to the Congress that the U.N. has a strong, independent inspector general, with independent investigatory powers that can report to the Sec-

retary General and the General Assembly of the United Nations, and to us that the monies are not being wasted, and that fraud is not occurring. That is a very important provision in this conference report.

Mr. ROBERTS. I want to thank the gentleman, and I want to really underscore again the importance of what he has done.

From the information I have, I note with interest from your map and from your statement that our U.N. representative voted to approve another three missions, one in Haiti, Liberia, and Rwanda. Wait a minute, make that four missions. There is another one in the Republic of Georgia I think.

Mr. ROGERS. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTS. All without consultation and notification, is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS. That is exactly correct. She voted in the U.N. Security Council a peacekeeping mission for the Republic of Georgia in the former Soviet Union in August of this year, in September the mission to Haiti, in September the mission to Liberia, and just a couple of weeks ago, October 5, Rwanda, none of which was the Congress consulted about, none of which did we receive notice about so that we could plan fiscally for it. I think it has just gotten out of hand.

Mr. ROBERTS. One final thing, and I said finally before, but is it true that the administration used the 21-day continuing resolution, and now wake up to this, is it true the administration used the 21-day continuing resolution to pay approximately \$321 million in U.N. bills before this Congress even passed the appropriation bill? Is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS. That is correct. Using the continuing resolution passed by this body, the State Department or the OMB used a 21-day CR to pay all of the peacekeeping arrearages for fiscal 1994. In addition, they also have already spent 76 percent of all the funds they expect us to appropriate in this bill, using a 21-day CR. This is highly unusual. It is not right. So, therefore, the gentleman is correct in his statement.

Mr. ROBERTS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I am not on the committee, and I am not on the Armed Services Committee or on the Foreign Affairs Committee, but I can tell you as a Member, like many Members in this body, I have a very keen and strong interest in this Nation's foreign policy. I do not want the Congress to intervene and trample on the rights of the Executive. My goodness, we cannot even get a majority around here to decide when to adjourn, let alone try to conduct any foreign policy.

But it is no wonder, with the record that the gentleman has demonstrated, and the kinds of things he has endeavored to put in this bill, that we are getting back into the business of considering the War Powers Act and requiring congressional approval of American in-

volvement in the so-called peacekeeping operations. We have risked and lost American lives in Somalia. I think the gentleman's efforts go a long ways toward making sure that does not happen again in other U.N. missions, and I thank him for his efforts and thank him for yielding.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN.]

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report to H.R. 2519, the Commerce-Justice-State fiscal year 1994 appropriations bill. As a member of the subcommittee, I would like to compliment Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member ROGERS for their hard work on this important legislation. They led the subcommittee through the difficult task of cutting \$1.5 billion from the President's request in order to meet our 602(b) allocation.

Upon review of this bill some of you may note that we have changed funding priorities for certain law enforcement programs. It became clear during the course of our hearings that Attorney General Reno had some new ideas on crime control initiatives. We have supported the new direction she is charting for the Justice Department to combat the alarming rise in crime in our Nation. For example, I am pleased to report to my colleagues that during conference we added 48 million dollars for State and local law enforcement assistance grants. In addition, we added 30 million dollars above the President's request for juvenile justice programs.

President Clinton is committed to addressing our Nation's competitiveness problems during his term. He has targeted programs in the National Institute of Standards and Technology in this regard. The goal is to enable Government and industry to team together as partners to improve manufacturing processes and perform cutting edge research and development on tomorrow's products. The subcommittee provided a 35 percent increase over fiscal year 1993 funds to allow NIST to fulfill President Clinton's initiative.

We have provided an 18 percent increase for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. These funds are critical to maintain our national ocean service programs, our national marine fisheries programs, and our satellite and environmental programs. I am particularly pleased that we have been able to provide desperately needed funds to modernize the National Weather Service.

This conference report allows us to maintain our commitment to public broadcasting through the Public Telecommunications and Facilities Program. And we provide funds to initiate

President Clinton's Information Highway Grant Program.

In this bill the committee is showing strong support for the Economic Development Administration. EDA serves an extremely important function in our Government—it is the only agency with an exclusive mandate to provide technical and financial assistance to economically distressed areas. Now, more than ever, EDA funds are needed by communities in every congressional district to overcome the effects of a slowly recovering economy.

This bill provides funds for small business administration programs. As we all know, the growth of small business is essential to the health of our Nation's economy. The SBA is the central Government agency responsible for encouraging and nurturing that growth. I am pleased to say that, through the funding levels in this bill, we are continuing our commitment to small business development centers, the Guaranteed Business Loan Program and the 8(A) Program that benefits disadvantaged businesses.

Finally, I am pleased to report to my colleagues that we have reached a reasonable compromise on the controversial radio and TV Marti. I am hopeful that the three-member advisory panel established by this legislation will help resolve the long-standing concerns on both sides associated with radio and TV Marti.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

□ 2000

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the House and Senate conferees have reached agreement on the Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary appropriations bill for this new fiscal year, and I think we have produced a bipartisan, balanced bill. I want to thank and congratulate chairman SMITH, our distinguished ranking member Mr. ROGERS, my colleagues on the subcommittee, and our terrific staff for a job well done.

The bill finances a wide range of governmental activities, from scientific research to law enforcement to immigration control to diplomatic activities to international peacekeeping. We tried to satisfy the diverse needs of these programs while keeping in mind our need to keep spending down.

In this bill, we have managed to do both.

Let us keep one key fact in mind as we vote on this bill. It appropriates \$200 million less than these programs spent last year. That's not a decrease in the rate of increase, and it's not a decrease below the 1994 base. It is a \$200 million cut in spending, and, in addition, \$1.5 billion less than the administration's budget request.

While achieving significant savings, this bill still provides increased funding for essential Government activities. Among those are the scientific research and technology transfer programs of the Commerce Department. NOAA, NIST, and NTIA programs can play a major role in revitalizing our economy; they are absolutely essential to our effort to prepare our businesses and our workers for the globalized economy of the 21st century. These three Commerce Department agencies represent precisely the type of research and applied technology efforts the Federal Government needs to encourage to make our economy thrive.

Within these programs, I am particularly pleased that we were able to honor the request for almost \$62 million to help renovate the laboratory facilities of the National Institute of Standards and Technology. We have more than 2 billion dollars' worth of NIST facilities—built between 25 and 40 years ago, that are deteriorating at an alarming rate. These renovation funds are a prudent investment and will help NIST continue to play its vital role in promoting our country's long-term economic health.

I would like to point out that the bill provides \$2.156 billion for the courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services—including \$16 million to meet the highest priority needs of the Federal courts. This is an important reference that should not go unnoticed by states still struggling to recover from the economic downturn the country experienced in the last few years. It is my hope, and I believe the intention of the members of the conference committee, that this money will be used to add all of the 35 new bankruptcy judges we authorized during the 102d Congress.

The conference report states that the judicial conference is to "examine carefully the pending bankruptcy caseload of each of the districts with newly authorized judgeships and fill those with the greatest backlog and complexity of cases first." Certainly, the most needy of those districts deserve priority attention, but all 35 judges should be appointed as soon as possible.

We are making great strides in improving the economic fortune of the country, and these judges will help further that effort. The backlog of cases in bankruptcy courts only slows our recovery as debtors, creditors, and others with some relation to these cases sit and wait for resolution. These delays not only cost time, but money as well. It is important that these cases move as swiftly as possible to their conclusion, and the bill provides the funding to break the existing logjam.

I'm also pleased that we were able to maintain the House Appropriations Committee's funding level for the Legal Services Corporation [LSC]. The \$400 million in this bill is less than the

LSC requested, and far less than it needs. One of the basic principles of our system of justice is that any party to a legal dispute is due a fair hearing in a court of law. To meet that standard, we have to provide competent legal representation for those who cannot afford it, in both civil and criminal cases. The LSC is an essential part of the efforts to provide justice to all Americans. I support its efforts, and hope that we will be able to provide more resources for this valuable program in the future.

Finally, the conferees approved a reasonable, constructive compromise on the issue of funding our Government's broadcasts to Cuba. I anticipate that the process set in motion by the bill will lead to real reforms and cost savings at Radio Marti and the orderly termination of TV Marti.

The agreement cuts 25 percent of the budget for these programs and establishes a short-term, independent advisory panel to investigate and make recommendations regarding Radio Marti's policies and standards, and TV Marti's technical viability. In the case of Radio Marti, I have been concerned by evidence of bloated budgets, conflict of interest, and inappropriate programming. The independent review panel this bill creates is specifically required to address these concerns. And to ensure that the panel's work is not just left to gather dust on a shelf, over one-third of the funding for Radio Marti is tied to the implementation of the panel's recommendation by the Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

With respect to TV Marti, the issue of program quality is secondary to the threshold question of whether the Cuban people can see it. The evidence, both anecdotal and official, concludes that jamming continues to effectively prevent TV Marti's signal from reaching its intended audience—and from fulfilling its mission. I fully anticipate that the panel will reach the same conclusion, and that the USIA Director will pull the plug on TV Marti.

I include in the RECORD at this point the declassified text of recent official reports on the reception of TV Marti in Cuba—reports which underscore the extensive technical problems that exist in this program:

(Declassified by DRHamilton on 6 Oct 93 following consultations with USINT HAVANA. The following texts have been slightly altered to permit declassification. Deletions are marked — and insertions are indicated by *italic.*)

REPORT ONE, DATED SEPTEMBER 3, 1993

Para. 3. TV Marti found a crack in Cuban Electronic Curtain: — monitoring of TV Marti Broadcasts to Cuba has repeatedly (one line garbled, text probably not lost) demonstrated points for a minute or two before the jamming starts. Once the jammers come on, however, the TV becomes hash and noise. — monitoring of the TV Marti broadcast on September 1 detected a small difference for the first time — in a small

area, perhaps a window between jammers, just after 5 a.m., in which — the sound could be heard and — the color broadcast of the TV Marti program viewed for a few minutes. The area is near Playa Solada between Mariel and Havana, does not appear to be more than a few square miles in size and is lightly populated region, but this area will be explored further — and reported fully to TV Marti.

REPORT TWO, DATED SEPTEMBER 10, 1993

Para. 3. Window for TV Marti broadcasts is tiny: — the TV Marti program was received on three occasions in a small area about 35 kilometers west of Havana. It appears as though a small gap of from five to ten kilometers in length exists between Cuban jamming west of Havana and just to the east of the Port Town of Mariel. Depending on atmospheric conditions, the TV Marti signal has been picked up about five miles east of Mariel (just beyond the Pan American Polytechnic School) and in an area of from five to ten kilometers further east toward Havana (always terminating before Playa Solada). Sound is always audible first as the high pitched tone of the jammers fades, and then the video becomes clearer toward the center of the area but is never good. One morning, September 3, the TV Marti signal was completely overshadowed by Channel 13, TWT, the CBS affiliate station in Tampa, Florida. On each of the occasions that TV Marti was observed on a handheld battery-powered (Sony-Watchman) receiver, electricity was on in the area. However, the region is very sparsely populated and the reception that is possible along the coast fades out before reaching the central highway about six to eight kilometers further inland.

REPORT THREE, DATED SEPTEMBER 14, 1993

1. Summary: As requested, — the Mariel/Pinar Del Rio area west of Havana has been monitored eleven times since new TV Marti broadcast protocol was initiated August 31 to determine whether TV Marti signal could be received. On three occasions TV Marti programs were received at least faintly in a small area about 35 KMS west of Havana, a few kilometers east of Mariel. This reception area is very sparsely populated and extends no more than a few kilometers south of the coast road and for about ten kilometers from east to west, although variations were noted due to atmospheric conditions. Electricity appeared to be available during each monitoring excursion, and jamming was detected about half the time. End summary.

2. — routes and times were varied to maximize the range of observations possible. The total distance covered on round trips — varied from 169 KMS to 72 KMS and start times were from 2:45 a.m. to 3:30 a.m. The average trip was about 100 KMS with stops every few KMS to extend the antenna outside the car and check for reception during a one- to two-minute interval. Monitoring was always concluded in the Mariel area when TV Marti programming concluded at 6:00 a.m., —. Reception was tested on a Sony Watchman hand-held receiver which was thoroughly checked — before project began and again after one week. Electricity appeared to be available throughout the monitoring area each morning, but very few lights showed in residences. Routes covered inhabited areas more intensively, and then concentrated on the area east of Mariel where reception was detected repeatedly. No TV Marti signal was ever observed at any point in either Pinar Del Rio Province of the Havana suburbs.

3. Here are the detailed results for each date:

August 31: Observed heavy static and snow only. Took coast road to Mariel; made multiple observations around La Puntilla and in town suburbs. 96 KMS.

September 1: Took central highway to Guanajuay, west of Mariel, and started monitoring there at about 3:30 a.m. Observed heavy jamming until reaching an area about five kilometers east of Mariel (just beyond the Politecnica Panamericana). Detected first sound of TV Marti program and then picture just after 5:20 a.m. and at next two stops. All reception faded well before Playa Salado. Width of reception area was about eight to ten kilometers, and very few homes were noticed. 108 KMS.

September 2: Took Autopista to Artemisa (west of Guanajuay) and returned by coast road. Concluded monitoring near the Politecnica at 6:00 a.m. Observed only noise and snow. 124 KMS.

September 3: Took coast road and started careful monitoring near the coast guard school just beyond the Marina Hemingway in the extreme western suburbs of Havana. Detected heavy jamming until a few kilometers beyond Playa Salado. When jamming faded completely, — got excellent reception of TVT-channel 13, the CBS affiliate station from Tampa, Florida. The TVT program was visible right up to the cement plant on the outskirts of Mariel. 97 KMS.

September 4 and 5: No observations.

September 6: Took the central highway deep into Pinar del Rio Province (reached KM 70 on the highway at 3:30 a.m.) where monitoring was started well east of Candelaria. Detected fairly strong jamming as side roads meandered through the countryside. Reached area of previous TV Marti reception, but detected only jamming until a little closer to the firing range (half way from Mariel to Playa Salado). Finally detected clear audio with poor picture at 5:45 a.m. to hear an excellent report on the commemoration of Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream" speech. Reception window was very narrow. 169 KMS.

September 7: Took central highway to Mariel and monitored in Mariel area and side roads. Observed only noise and snow. 72 KMS.

September 8: Took coast highway to Mariel and east almost to Artemisa. On return TV Marti was detected from just opposite the Politecnica almost to Playa Salado, a window of about 12 KMS in length. Reception was quite clear. 98 KMS.

September 9: No observation.

September 10: Very strong jamming was observed everywhere. Took central highway to the exit for Playa Salado and concentrated route in small towns and villages (Banes, Agnate, Caimito, etc.) that are a few kilometers inland from the areas in which TV Marti had been received. 96 KMS.

September 11: No observation.

September 12: Repeated successful September 8 route but received only noise and snow. 98 KMS.

September 13: Concentrated on coastal road routes during very bad atmospheric conditions (some lightning and thunder in distance). Received only noise and snow. Conditions were so bad that even Radio Marti could not be received at all on short-wave until after 7:00 a.m. 78 KMS.

September 14: Poor atmospheric conditions again. Observed only noise and snow on TV, while Radio Marti faded in and out on short-wave. Repeated observations in central highway area to coast road as on September 10. 101 KMS.

REPORT FOUR, DATED SEPTEMBER 29, 1993

1. Summary: — additional monitoring was conducted to detect visibility of TV Marti signal in the beach cities area, east of Havana, on September 28, and 29. A very poor signal was detected briefly on September 28. But much better reception was detected over a broad area on September 29.

— End summary.

2. Here are the details of the Broadcast reception:

During poor atmospheric conditions of September 28, the TV Marti audio signal was first received in the Guanabo area and was clearly audible for about ten minutes while driving east about 0420 hours. No picture, however, was ever detected very clearly. Boomerang car antenna with video walkman recently supplied by TV Marti used to monitor signal. A total of 144 KMS from residence to an area about 15 KMS east of Santa Cruz Del Norte was covered during the entire TV Marti Broadcast period.

TV Marti program was heard fairly clearly throughout most of the beach city area east of Havana on September 29. Starting a few miles east of Cojimar (at 0355 Hours) and running through the fairly populous area up to Guanabo and the less populated areas up to el Abra—70 KMS east of Havana—most of the broadcast could be understood on the way out and back (until 0550 hours), a total of 149 KMS. A clear video signal was received only intermittently, probably due to poor atmospheric conditions. Electricity appeared to be available throughout the monitoring area. Equipment was same as on September 28.

I wish to stress that TV Marti's fate has, I believe correctly, been tied to specific questions about its reception and effectiveness, not broader considerations of our policy toward Cuba. In reaching this agreement, all of us involved have restated our strong support for democracy in Cuba. Fidel Castro's dictatorship should find no solace in this decision.

The conference agreement requires that the Director reach a decision on TV Marti's efficacy by July 1, 1993, and fences \$2.5 million of the budget to cover close-out costs, but I'd note that the Director has the authority to make a decision on termination before then, and I encourage him not to wait until the last minute.

To summarize, Mr. Speaker, this is a good, taut bill. It finances the necessary functions of government, and it takes into account the need to put our Federal financial house in order. I urge its passage.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report on the Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary appropriations bill, and I urge my colleagues to support this well-crafted agreement.

As a new member of this Appropriations subcommittee, I want to thank Chairman SMITH and the ranking member, Mr. ROGERS, and our other colleagues and our fine staff for the hard work and cooperative spirit which have led to this conference agreement.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill of amazingly broad scope. It includes: international trade, advanced technology, law enforcement, peacekeeping, foreign affairs, the entire judicial branch of Government, important independent agencies such as the Small Business Administration, Federal Communications Commission, Federal Trade Commission, and yet to merely list these worthy agencies and programs in one bill points up some of the severest choices and tradeoffs of any appropriations bill that we consider in this House.

So we did have tough choices, but we brought in this conference report \$219 million below the fiscal 1993 funding level, and we reduced the President's budget request by \$1.5 billion. Let me detail some of those specific cuts: We have \$84 million less for the Justice Department than we had last year and \$260 million less than the President's request. We have \$343 million less for the State Department than we had last year, \$589 million less than the President's request. We have \$52 million less than we had last year for payments to international organizations. We are appropriating \$21 million less than in 1993 for the USIA, \$189 million less for the Maritime Administration, \$93 million less than fiscal 1993 for the Economic Development Administration, and on and on.

We have made the tough spending cuts. The cuts are real. They are significant. Many agencies have been affected.

At the same time, this cutting has permitted some additional flexibility in funding some of the most promising initiatives of the Clinton administration.

For example, we have been able to increase the commitment to the National Institute of Standards and Technology by 35 percent. That is \$136 million more than last year.

That is money well spent.

It includes \$199 million for the advanced technology program to support industry-led research efforts to develop new technologies that increase our country's competitiveness.

We have two important examples of that commitment in North Carolina, working with the national textile and apparel industry.

The National Textile Center, a consortium of four southeastern universities based at North Carolina State University, is conducting core research for the textile industry. The so-called T.C. Squared consortium is also provided matching funds in this bill. It is a nonprofit, member-driven Government-industry partnership that serves as a vehicle for the development and the transfer of manufacturing technology in the apparel industry.

This is just one example of how these advanced technology funds are well spent. I am pleased that this sub-

committee has been able to provide additional resources for this and other advanced technology programs to enhance our country's competitive edge.

We were also able to provide \$26 million for new information infrastructure grants. Again, North Carolina has made great strides in this area. Our State has its own information highway in place, and we will be submitting an application under the new competitive grants process to demonstrate the applications of tele-medicine by linking the four medical schools and teaching hospitals in our State with the Army hospital at Fort Bragg to support teleconferencing, the high-speed exchange of data and high-resolution radiological images, and the linking of remote rural and military sites.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, an excellent conference report. It demonstrates our commitment both to reduce spending and to redirect spending to the areas of maximum economic payoff. We have made the tough choices while providing the flexibility for new and promising initiatives, and I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

□ 2010

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman yielding this time to me. I would ask the distinguished chairman to enter into a colloquy with me.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would be glad to.

Mr. HOYER. Is it the chairman's understanding that the Census Bureau's funding level under the conference agreement will not result in any reductions in force beyond those envisioned in the administration's own budget request?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland, is correct. The administration's budget request assumed that temporary employees winding up their work on the 1990 census would be leaving Government employment, but the conference agreement funding level should not require any reduction in force at the Census Bureau beyond that.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the distinguished gentleman for clarifying this point. As I am sure the gentleman can understand, Census Bureau employees in the metropolitan area have been very concerned about the workforce implications of the Bureau's budget under the conference agreement, and the gentleman's clarifying comments should go a long way toward calming those waters.

In thanking my colleague, I would like to acknowledge the excellent work of the subcommittee staff and thank them, too, for their assistance.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to commend the gentleman and the members of the conference committee for their hard work on the conference report on State, Commerce and Justice. They have done an excellent job with this bill; however, I rise to take some exception to specific cuts with respect to the Census Bureau, which is located in my district. It is my understanding that the conference committee report contains a budget cut of \$54 million below that which was requested by the President.

Now, I understand that the chairman has some concerns about the performance of the Census Bureau, and I certainly believe they have merit. At the same time, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee on Census, I have heard numerous hours of testimony about changes that are being made at the Census Bureau to improve our performance over the year 2000 census and that it will be an improvement over 1990. I am encouraged by these reports. I would just like to say that while I am concerned about these cuts, I would like to work with the gentleman in the future and perhaps revisit this issue for next year's budget to insure that these cuts do not result in a less accurate census, but rather that we have the necessary manpower and necessary personnel to achieve an even more accurate census in the year 2000; but again, I want to commend the committee for its hard work in this issue.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], a member of the full committee.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding this time to me. I want to compliment him and the chairman of the subcommittee for coming to some very successful conclusions with the Senate on this conference.

They have come up with some good ideas. Unfortunately, they are in report language. I wish they were in bill language.

I hope that this body starts to take note of what they have accomplished, because frankly, it goes a long way toward where we should be going, but it does not get over the goal.

They call for a peacekeeping consultation between the White House and the Congress, asking the White House to let us know 15 days in advance before they detail our troops all over the world.

They call for a reduction of the 31.7 percent—and by the way, only 6 months ago it was 30.4 percent. The Clinton administration boosted the allotment to a 31.7 cost share by the United States for peacekeeping missions under the United Nations all

around the world. They called for that to be reduced to 25 percent.

They called for the United Nations to give us credit for such expenditures like the billion dollars that we spent on our Defense Department moving our troops into Somalia before the United Nations starts picking up the bill. We ought to get credit for that against anything that we owed the United Nations.

Frankly, I am concerned about the totality of the situation. We are using our military. They are not the exclusive military in the U.N. peacekeeping mission, but our soldiers, our Marines, their lives, our airmen, their lives are on the line in Somalia, and soon to be Haiti and all these other places in the world. We are going to put them on the line. We are going to risk their lives, and then we are going to pay 31 percent of the U.N. peacekeeping costs? Give me a break.

The fact is that only a few months ago, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] pointed out, we were involved in peacekeeping missions in 13 countries. Now it is 18. There are some 74,000 U.S. troops involved in these peacekeeping missions.

They are contemplating in the White House sending United States troops to Sudan, Zaire, South Africa, Togo, Bosnia, Papua, New Guinea, the Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan; the list is endless.

Why? Because Morton Halperin, the Assistant Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State and various other gurus have decided it is important to take U.S. troops and put them under the auspices and direction of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, they should not be under the direction of the United Nations. They should be under our leadership. They should be going to places of United States interest and they should not be deployed all over the world to be sniped at by people like what happened in Somalia just a few days back.

There was a Presidential Directive No. 18 that says that U.S. troops will be used under the United Nations direction. That needs to be repealed.

Morton Halperin, the Assistant Secretary of Defense, needs to be canned, needs to be fired.

We need to bring our troops back and we need to forget this misbegotten policy.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

It is my understanding that the conferees on H.R. 2519, in providing funding above last year's appropriation level for the National Sea Grant College Program, intend that this new funding supplement Sea Grant's current level of expenditure for marine

biotechnology, not act as a replacement for those expenditures. Is my understanding of the conferees' intent correct?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct. The amounts provided to Sea Grant for marine biotechnology are not intended to supplant the program's current expenditures on these activities.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. That is an important distinction, though a subtle one.

May I just also say that the gentleman and his subcommittee have my great appreciation and that of our authorizing committee, under extraordinarily difficult circumstances.

I think the chairman and the members of his subcommittee have done remarkably well providing particularly for those programs in NOAA and the ocean and coastal fisheries. We appreciate the constraints under which the gentleman is operating, and we appreciate what he has been able to come up with.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I want to say that we try to work with the full committee chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee and the gentleman's committee has been very good to work with.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE].

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2519.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will allow the President to implement important elements of his technology policy. It provides appropriations for the technology programs of the Department of Commerce close to the level requested by the administration and authorized in H.R. 820. That bill passed the House overwhelmingly in May.

These programs include the inhouse research and the extramural programs of the National Institute of Standards and Technology [NIST], as well as the activities of the Technology Administration.

Our committee carefully reviewed and strongly endorses the Department of Commerce technology programs slated for funding in this bill.

Strengthening the technology programs of the Commerce Department is essential for the President's technology policy to succeed. The need is clear. The administration's approach is sound.

I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], and the conferees for bringing this conference report to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the measure.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

I rise in support of the conference report and to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] for their work in bringing this conference report to the floor. This bill always presents difficult funding decisions, and I want to compliment them on the final product.

The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology authorizes two of the important programs for which funds are appropriated in this act: the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and technology programs at the Department of Commerce, including the National Institute of Standards and Technology. The chairman has consulted with me on these programs, and I am pleased that for the most part the bill comes very close to funding the programs and priorities which the authorizing committee has reported.

With respect to NOAA, the bill almost fully funds the critical operations of the National Weather Service. As we've seen from the spate of natural weather disasters in this country over the last few years, the warnings provided by the National Weather Service have saved countless lives and reduced property losses. As many Members know, our weather offices are in dire need of modernization, and I am pleased that the Weather Service Modernization Program is nearly fully funded. In addition, the conference report includes much needed funds for a new NOAA hurricane research and reconnaissance aircraft to supplement the aging fleet. These funds should enable the Weather Service to continue to supply us with the accurate and dependable weather warnings and services upon which we have come to rely.

The bill also recognizes the growing importance of the Department of Commerce's Technology Administration and the National Institute of Standards and Technology in maintaining our economic competitiveness. The Clinton administration had requested a major increase for NIST to fund the President's technology policy. While the bill does not provide all of the funding requested by the President, it appropriates \$525.9 million, an increase of \$137.2 million, or nearly 35 percent, over last year's appropriations. The bill also provides an important increase in NIST's in-house research budget to provide an enhanced in-house capability to provide technical and scientific support to these endeavors. These funding levels are comparable to those provided in H.R. 820, the National Competitiveness Act, which passed the House earlier this year.

Mr. Chairman, I again want to commend the conferees on their excellent work, and I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], a member of the committee.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express particular support for the funding of this conference report for the USIA and the Board for International Broadcasting which I believe continue to perform very valuable services for our country as we struggle to define our role in the post-cold-war era.

I believe that the BIB is one of the very best programs we fund. Through its oversight of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, the BIB has played an essential role in bringing freedom to the people of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

□ 2020

Although the cold war is over, the need for surrogate broadcasting is not. Neither communism, nor fascism, are dead, either within the fragile democracies of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union or within the authoritarian societies of Asia. It takes time for a country and its citizens to develop the institutions of freedom. It takes a commitment by countries with a strong history of democratic principles to help these peoples adapt to the institutions of freedom.

This report also provides funding for the USIA, which administers the Voice of America. I strongly support the ongoing efforts of VOA to broadcast news and the message of our country to the world, and I will continue to support providing funds to VOA so that they may carry out their important mission.

While I also strongly support the committee's efforts to provide funding for the BIB and USIA, I believe administration plans underway to reorganize our broadcasting services are poorly conceived and could result in undermining the nature and progress of the surrogate radios.

As coauthor of legislation to create Radio Free Asia, I believe that the BIB should have authority over the newly proposed Asian surrogate service. Given its track record of success, BIB is a logical home for an Asian surrogate service. Most importantly, BIB has the independence needed to make the Radio Free Asia broadcasts credible and effective.

Funding surrogate radio in Asia is one of the smartest initiatives we can pursue to advance our national interest and values. I sincerely hope that, when the reorganization of our broadcasting services occurs, Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty and Radio Free Asia are under a board which enjoys the same independence as the BIB has always had. This independence is vitally important to their success.

Finally, I strongly support funding for the National Endowment for Democracy in this conference report. I plan to speak on this issue later, but briefly, I believe that our Nation should be looking outward and using this incredible opportunity to promote our values overseas. NED is one of our best tools to achieve that end, and I believe we should continue to utilize NED's great expertise.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ].

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report for H.R. 2519.

I appreciate the hard work and the difficult choices that the conferees had to make.

In these times of limited budgetary options, I am pleased that the conferees gave special consideration to the ocean and coastal programs of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

As the chairman of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over NOAA's ocean and coastal programs, I am very familiar with the importance and value of supporting these efforts.

I am particularly encouraged with the appropriation levels which have been provided in the conference report for the Coastal Zone Management Program, the National Undersea Research Program, the National Sea Grant College Program, and the National Marine Sanctuary Program.

The list of problems which face our coastal areas is astonishing. Loss of fisheries, coastal pollution, red tides, non-indigenous species, habitat loss * * * the list goes on and on.

Each of these programs provide unique services in addressing these problems by helping to understand, manage, and protect our coastal resources.

It is imperative that we support these programs and others which are the front line for coastal research and management.

I think that it is also important to note that these are programs which have traditionally been congressional priorities.

There has been a lot of progress made in the past few years in reconciling the differences of opinion with the administration in regard to funding requests for these programs.

I urge Members to continue working with the administration to achieve adequate funding requests for each of them.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Appropriation Subcommittee chairman, Mr. SMITH, for his continued hard work and leadership, and I urge the Members to support this conference report.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PETE GEREN].

Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report, and I would like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH]. I ask the gentleman, "Is it your understanding that this conference report does not intend, imply, or require that the southern region headquarters of the National Weather Service be closed or consolidated?"

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is our understanding. In fact, they have told us they do not intend to.

Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas. Furthermore, is it the gentleman's understanding that NOAA will use funds from the \$319 million appropriated for local warnings and forecasts in this conference report to fully fund and staff the southern region headquarters of the National Weather Service?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes; we understand that NOAA will use a portion of these funds to maintain the southern region headquarters.

Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). The Chair would advise Members controlling the debate time that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] has 7 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] has 8 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the very distinguished ranking Republican on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2519 making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice and State.

In general this bill has provided funding for the foreign affairs agencies within the House passed authorization levels. The bill also provides a waiver of the statutory requirement for an authorization of the State Department and USIA, of 6 months. Regrettably this is necessary because of a holdup of consideration of the State Department and USIA authorization bill in the Senate.

The House responsibly passed the authorization bill in June, and I hope that the Senate will resolve to quickly consider the bill so we can complete action on the measure.

Briefly, I want to commend the appropriations managers for the conference report language that addresses the egregious problems that persist with U.N. peacekeeping, and secondly, for recognizing the urgent need for the

State Department to upgrade the consular visa and passport systems.

We included an important amendment in the authorization bill directing the State Department to upgrade its visa control system, and allowing them to collect and retain fees for this purpose.

Specifically, with regard to title V, of the conference report, I would like to commend the authors of this legislation regarding their provisions designed to increase the role of Congress in supporting U.S. contributions to U.N. peacekeeping activities.

As ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I fully support the efforts of my Appropriations Committee colleagues to rein in the runaway U.S. peacekeeping costs. Requiring that our future assessment be limited to no more than 25 percent of the total cost for each peacekeeping mission is an important step toward this goal.

Equally important is the provision mandating improved congressional notification for all future decisions to create new peacekeeping missions or to expand any ongoing missions. Without congressional notification, the administration has recently approved our participation in three new and expanded missions in Haiti, Liberia, and Rwanda. Adoption of the provisions in this conference report should enable Congress to play a greater more informed role in formulating our overall policy toward these and other U.N. peacekeeping operations.

I would like also to address the issue of visa processing and the antiquated, unreliable and user intensive, microfiche systems that the State Department uses in over 100 overseas posts to maintain the list of aliens ineligible for entry.

This list includes names of terrorists, and those with criminal histories. The embarrassing case of radical sheik Omar Abdul Rahman getting a United States travel visa, despite being on a microfiche lookout list in Khartoum, Sudan, should be all the evidence we need that the system is broken and badly needs repair.

Not only must we modernize the outdated equipment, but we must have the State Department resume checking the FBI criminal record histories of those who seek to immigrate to the United States and have lived in the United States previously.

Not only should the State Department find moneys to modernize its equipment as the conferees recommend but it needs to resume these FBI criminal record checks promptly before we have another possible even more embarrassing visa case, as we did with Sheik Rahman with his tourist visa in 1990.

Lastly, at the appropriate time, I will rise to support the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary, the gentleman

from Iowa's [Mr. SMITH] motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to fund the National Endowment for Democracy.

Democracy building is a central theme of our foreign policy, and the endowment was designed and created and proven to be an effective tool to serve this vital U.S. interest.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON].

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, the House Appropriations Committee report on H.R. 2519 stated that:

The Committee intends that recreational fishing harvest monitoring data collection be expanded to include the Northeast.

However, the conference report does not contain this language.

Both the House and Senate included \$195,000 above the administration's request for recreational fishery harvest monitoring. Is it the chairman's understanding that the conferees still intend that these moneys can be used to expand recreational harvest monitoring data to the northeast?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes, it is still the intention of the conferees that those funds be used for that purpose.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] for his answer and for his willingness to work with me in my new position as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries Management. I commend him and his staff for their fine work on this matter.

□ 2030

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], a very distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report, and particularly would like to commend the conferees for taking strong action on downsizing the funding for the United Nations regular and peacekeeping operations.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I had the oratory skills of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] or the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS]. But I would like to speak for a moment as a father, and from the heart, for something I think needs to be said about this whole U.N. peacekeeping fiasco we are into.

As a father of a son who is 16 years of age and a junior in one of our Nation's leading military academies at Northwestern, Lake Geneva, I remember back to when I was his age in high school, filled with idealism, and decided to volunteer for the military. In doing so I took an oath to serve my Commander in Chief. Mr. Speaker, today we have heard the discussion

here of what has happened in Somalia and what is probably going to happen in Bosnia and other countries that we have never heard of around the world. And we look at the Commander in Chief, who at the time when SAM JOHNSON, one of our colleagues, was a prisoner of war in a Vietnam prison camp, when other mothers and fathers were sending their sons off to battle, Walter Cronkite was on CBS every night telling us what a lousy bunch of people our troops were and how wrong the United States was. And as we lost confidence in our military, that is like mom and dad losing confidence in their kids, because people in the military need the support of the country behind them.

While this was going on, there was another young man who decided to go to the Soviet Union and protest against America's policies. Today that young man is now the Commander in Chief. He now is sending our young men off in harm's way. And when people who are wise in the ways of the military ask for simple military measures to protect our own troops, he denies that protection, and 18 young men are killed in Somalia.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is long overdue that we as a nation and those of us here in Congress, who have a responsibility to those moms and dads, two in my district who lost their sons in Somalia, for no reason, that we have a right to question that policy and we have a responsibility as Members of this organization to shut off their lifeblood, that is, the money of the taxpayers of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that the United Nations be reformed. It is not part of the United States. It is not our role to fund it. It is not our role to put our young men and women in harm's way to satisfy a very corrupt group that is full of cronyism. And the one thing that they can claim as a success, in Cambodia, which was riddled with tens of millions of dollars of graft and corruption, bids that were given to cronies, supplies that were never unpacked, and then we are asked to take the young men and women of this country and put them in harm's way to satisfy the policy and the fascination of a young man who shirked his responsibility and never served his country in harm's way?

Mr. Speaker, over my dead body will there be another young man go and be killed because of that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report.

I particularly want to commend the conferees for taking strong action on downsizing funding U.N. regular and peacekeeping operations.

The conferees included statutory language requiring the United Nations to set up and operate an inspector general system before we fully fund that organization. I do not consider this Congress micromanaging foreign policy. It is an expression of our frustration with a once

well-intended organization which has fallen prey to corruption and cronyism of the worst sort.

I also strongly endorse the conferee's report language requiring the administration to report to Congress in advance of security council votes on new peacekeeping operations and the desire of the conferees to reduce U.S. peacekeeping assessments from 32 to 25 percent. Frankly, I wish these requirements were also statutory requirements, not report language.

If the United Nations does not make substantial progress toward reform then I believe the administration should consider calling together the other major U.N. contributors and take more direct action.

To quote a member of the U.S. Commission on Improving the Effectiveness of the U.N., Gray MacDougal:

If the organization did not already exist, no rational human being would recommend that anything resembling the present structure be created. This unfortunate starting point is compounded by a U.N. secretariat leadership that readily takes on additional responsibilities and shows every indication of being a bottomless financial pit.

Even so-called success stories like the peacekeeping operation in Cambodia has documented tens of millions of dollars in waste and fraud including equipment never needed or unpacked and millions in contracts given to preferred contractors even though their bids were far higher than other companies. The United Nations refuses to give the United States copies of the internal audits documenting the widespread fraud.

At the end of my statement I will submit for the RECORD a recent article I authored on this subject which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor. But I want to briefly touch on one final point.

Although President Clinton publicly seems to distance himself from the United Nations, the President's actions do not match his words. Presidential decision directive 13 has sketched out an ambitious, dangerous and expensive administration policy of increased involvement with the U.N. It included putting U.S. soldiers under foreign commanders, sharing intelligence with U.N. members and increased so-called peacekeeping with U.S. troops. Although the President has refused to provide this document to Congress, bits and pieces of this decision directive have turned up in several authorization and appropriation bills.

In every case Congress has refused to endorse or fund his plans. Given the recent foreign policy fiascos in Somalia and Haiti, I think it's time for President Clinton to formally repudiate the contents of Presidential decision directive 13 and shift our United Nations policy to one of institutional reform.

I have lost two constituents in Somalia because this President feels it is more important to work with the United Nations than to protect the lives of troops abroad. Instead he congratulates himself on his Russia and Middle East policy.

The fact is his Russia policy is nothing more than a continuation of George Bush's work. And President Clinton's Middle East policy consists of setting up a card table in his front yard for a signing ceremony and taking credit for the fruits of George Bush's labor.

In closing, I again commend the conferees on a job well done and urge support of this conference report.

[From The Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 15, 1993]

U.N. NEEDS REFORM, NOT AN EXPANDED ROLE

(By Jim Lightfoot)

President Clinton went to the UN recently and said things Americans want to hear. Mr. Clinton warned the UN not to become engaged in every one of the world conflicts. He expressed America's desire to reduce its assessed costs for peacekeeping operations and encouraged the UN to make serious efforts to reduce wasteful spending.

Unfortunately, the President's actions do not match his speech. For months, his team has been preparing Presidential Decision Directive (PDD)-13 and its annex Presidential Review Document (PRD)-13. These two documents are the heart of a dangerous, expensive administration plan to strengthen the UN.

Among the many proposals included in PDD-13 placing United States troops under UN command; sharing classified intelligence with the UN; repealing the law that limits the amount of troops the US can commit to peacekeeping operations without congressional approval; and bypassing congressional approval for UN operations by establishing an account for peacekeeping and peace-making operations.

Despite Clinton's admonition that the UN must learn to say no to new peacekeeping operations, the US voted for the promoted questionable new operations over the last three months in Liberia, Rwanda, and Haiti. In August, the US voted to send an 88-man UN observer force to a war-torn area of the former Soviet Georgia. In fact, the administration is now working with the French on a possible second UN peacekeeping operation in Rwanda.

So far the administration has refused to provide PDD-13 or PRD-13 to Congress, although they have been leaked to the press. Clinton has sent bits and pieces of his proposals to Congress without disclosing his full intentions. In every case Congress has refused to fund his plan. In fact the House Appropriations Committee took even stronger action. The defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1994 included language requiring 15-day notification to Congress before any new humanitarian operations can take place. The bill also includes language that directs the administration to report to Congress on its proposals to strengthen the UN and forbids the administration from renovating and donating to the UN a defense facility for use as a UN peacekeeping headquarters.

Unfortunately, the Democrat leadership, probably acting at the request of the Clinton administration, stripped on procedural grounds the 15-day notification period from the appropriations bill.

The dismal performance of the United Nations in Somalia should make anyone nervous about giving the UN a blank check to commit American forces or funds to any peacekeeping operation it sees fit to create. Even the "success" story of the UN peacekeeping operation in Cambodia has documented tens of millions of dollars in waste and fraud, including equipment never needed or unpacked and millions in contracts given to preferred contractors even though their bids were far higher than those of other companies. The UN refuses to officially provide the US copies of the internal audits documenting the widespread fraud.

The UN's problems go deeper than its overreach on peacekeeping. As one member of the US Commission on Improving the Effectiveness of the UN, Gary MacDougal, notes: "If the organization did not already exist no rational human being would recommend that anything resembling the present structure be created. This unfortunate starting point is compounded by a UN Secretariat leadership that readily takes on additional responsibilities and shows every indication of being a bottomless financial pit."

In one respect, Clinton is right: Putting our economic house in order cannot mean we shut our windows to the world. But the solution to the UN problems is not more American money or troops. The US must use its influence and our allies must use their influence to reform UN operations.

We don't have to write a big check to expand UN peacekeeping operations. According to some estimates, reforms within current peacekeeping operations alone would save \$100 million a year. By insisting that the UN grows and reforms like the world around it, we can help achieve the noble goals of its founders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). The Chair would advise that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] has 7 minutes remaining and reserves the right to close debate, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one minute to engage the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] in a colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, due to a drafting error in the conference report, language was inadvertently omitted from the statement of managers concerning the relocation of the Pan American Health Organization.

Mr. Speaker, the Pan American Health Organization has approved a site in Montgomery County, MD, to locate its new headquarters. I wish to clarify the conferees' intention with respect to the use of funds provided to the organization in this conference report.

I would ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], is it the conferees' understanding that no funds provided in this bill shall be used directly or indirectly for the construction of the new headquarters.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes, it is the conferees' intention that none of the assessed U.S. contribution provided in this bill be used to fund the construction of a new headquarters for the Pan American World Health Organization.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to alert my colleagues that the conference committee's recommendations include 30 unauthorized line items totaling \$35,844,000 in 4 accounts: 1 totaling \$576,000 in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA] operations, research, and facilities account; 10 totaling \$18,578,000 in the NOAA construction account; 4 totaling \$3,590,000 in the International Trade Administration [ITA] operations and administration account; and 15 totaling \$13,100,000 in the Small Business Administration [SBA] salaries and expenses account. Note that six NOAA construction unauthorized line items totaling \$6,078,000, and

the ITA and SBA unauthorized line items had not been included in either the House-approved or Senate-approved versions of H.R. 2519.

A list of these unauthorized line items follows.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION [NOAA] UNAUTHORIZED LINE ITEMS: 11 TOTALING \$19,154,000

NOAA OPERATIONS, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES UNAUTHORIZED LINE ITEMS: 1 TOTALING \$576,000

1. \$576,000 for the Fish Farming Experimental Station at Stuttgart, Arkansas (Amendment No. 81, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; \$600,000 appropriated by Senate only.

NOAA Construction Unauthorized Line Items: 10 totaling \$18,578,000

1. \$2,000,000 for the construction of the National Marine Fisheries Service Estuarine and Habitat Research Laboratory in Lafayette, Louisiana (Amendment No. 82, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; \$6,250,000 appropriated by Senate only.

2. \$1,000,000 for a grant for the purchase of equipment for the Ruth Patrick Science Education Center in Aiken, South Carolina (Amendment No. 82, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

3. \$1,000,000 for construction and related expenses for a Multi-Species Aquaculture Facility to be located in the State of New Jersey (Amendment No. 82, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

4. \$1,000,000 for a grant to the Mystic Seaport, Mystic, Connecticut, for a maritime education center (Amendment No. 82, bill language).

Unauthorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

5. \$1,395,000 for a grant to the Indiana State University Center for Interdisciplinary Science Research and Education (funded under the Small Business Administration in previous fiscal years) (Amendment No. 82, bill language).

Unauthorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

\$1,000,000 for a grant for the Boston Biotechnology Innovation Center. (Amendment No. 82, bill language).

Unauthorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

\$683,000 for planning and design of a joint Federal and State Marine Laboratory to be located at the marine resources center at Fort Johnson, South Carolina (Amendment No. 82, report language).

Unauthorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

\$1,800,000 for the Newport, Oregon, Marine Science Center (Amendment No. 82, report language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; appropriated by Senate only.

\$500,000 for the Kodiak, Alaska, Fisheries Center (Amendment No. 82, report language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; appropriated by Senate only.

\$8,200,000 for Columbia River facilities (Amendment No. 82, report language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; appropriated by Senate only.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ADMINISTRATION [ITA]—OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION UNAUTHORIZED LINE ITEMS: 4 TOTALING \$3,590,000

1. \$800,000 for the Center for Global Competitiveness at Saint Francis and Saint Vin-

cent Colleges in Pennsylvania (Amendment No. 89, bill language).

Unauthorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

2. \$465,000 for the Center for Manufacturing Productivity at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst (Amendment No. 89, bill language).

Unauthorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

3. \$1,395,000 for the Massachusetts Biotechnology Research Institute (Amendment No. 89, bill language).

Unauthorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

4. \$930,000 for the Michigan Biotechnology Institute (Amendment No. 89, bill language).

Unauthorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION [SBA]—SALARIES AND EXPENSES UNAUTHORIZED LINE ITEMS: 15 totaling \$13,100,000

1. \$175,000 for a grant to the Ben Franklin Center in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to assist small business to qualify for and participate in the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) program (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

2. \$750,000 for a grant to the North Carolina Rural Economic Development Center for the North Carolina Small Business Capital Access Program to provide financial development assistance to small business (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

3. \$500,000 for a grant to the Van Emmons Population, Marketing Analysis Center in Towanda, Pennsylvania, for continuation of an integrated small business data base to aid Appalachian Region small businesses (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

4. \$1,000,000 for a grant to the City of Prestonsburg, Kentucky, for small business development assistance (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

5. \$680,000 for a grant to the State of Nebraska for a statewide small business data base to facilitate the development of small businesses in rural communities (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

6. \$100,000 for a grant to the Institute of Economic Development, Western Kentucky University to provide small business consulting services for senior citizens (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

7. \$5,000,000 for a grant for a National Center for Genome Resources in New Mexico to provide consulting assistance, information and related activities to small businesses (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; appropriated by Senate only.

8. \$1,000,000 for a grant to the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas, for the Genesis small business incubator facility (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

9. \$1,000,000 for a grant to the WVHTC Foundation in West Virginia for build out, equipment and operations costs for a small business incubator facility (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

10. \$300,000 for a grant to the Economic Development Council of Paducah, Kentucky, to assist in the development of a small business incubator facility (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

11. \$250,000 for a grant to Grant County, West Virginia, to establish a small business development fund to provide financial assistance to small businesses and grants (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

12. \$750,000 for a grant to Hazard Community College in Hazard, Kentucky, to assist in the development of a small business consulting, information and assistance facility (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

13. \$930,000 for a grant to Seton Hill College in Greensburg, Pennsylvania, to provide for a small business consulting and assistance center for entrepreneurial opportunity (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

14. \$200,000 for a grant to the University of Central Arkansas to assist the Small Business Institute Program of the Small Business Administration to establish and operate a National Data Center (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Not authorized by House or Senate; not appropriated by House or Senate.

15. \$465,000 for a grant to the Iowa Waste Reduction Center, University of Northern Iowa for a demonstration program to assist small business in complying with Federal regulatory requirements (Amendment No. 128, bill language).

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 2519, the bill that funds the Commerce, Justice and State Departments, the Federal judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal year 1994.

First, I would like to commend Chairman NEAL SMITH and the conferees for meeting the challenge that was before them. The conferees were able to set priorities in determining the funding levels for the various agencies and programs that this conference report supports, given the fiscal restraints they faced. But, the funding level in the resulting conference report is not only below the subcommittee's target, as set by the Appropriations Committee based on this year's budget resolution. It is also less than the amount requested by the President, and below last year's funding level.

The Commerce-Justice-State conference report supports a diverse number of agencies and programs. They include community policing efforts, law enforcement against organized crime, the Federal Bureau of Investigation [FBI], and our Federal prisons; the operation of our national fisheries and our marine, weather, environmental and satellite programs; the Immigration and Naturalization Service; the National Weather Service; and the Small Business Administration.

The conference report's support of the President's new immigration initiative is of tremendous importance to California, given the serious problems that we are having with illegal immigration. It targets funds for additional

land border inspectors, additional Border Patrol agents, increased pre-inspection at airports, and more asylum officers. The conference report also increases immigration inspection fees on foreigners entering the country by plane or boat from \$5 to \$6—an increase that is expected to raise \$50 million.

The conference report provides grants to State and local law enforcement agencies to assist them in safeguarding our neighborhoods and communities. It also supports juvenile justice programs, FBI start-up costs for creating a national background check system, and a new community policing effort so that State and local governments can put more officers on the street and employ innovative techniques to prevent crime.

The Small Business Administration—known for its direct and guaranteed loan assistance to small businesses—is funded by this conference report, as is the Economic Development Administration [EDA]. The EDA, in turn, supports the efforts of my district's Tri-County Economic Development Corp. [TCEDC], which was formed in 1985 to serve as the economic development planning and coordinating agency for Butte, Glenn, and Tehama Counties. Over the past 8 years, TCEDC has financed a revolving loan fund that has worked in partnership with private lenders to provide loans to small businesses, creating over 250 jobs. Without the financial support provided in this conference report, economic development programs in these three counties would be seriously jeopardized.

Also important to my constituents is the conference report's support of SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics. SEARCH is comprised of Governors' appointees from all States. These appointees are dedicated to assisting State and local criminal justice agencies in building, operating, and improving their computer systems to combat crime, all at no cost. In the past, SEARCH has assisted the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department Crime Analysis Unit in mapping a series of car-jackings that took place at gunpoint in the Sacramento area; this mapped information was then distributed to patrol forces. SEARCH also helped the Sutter County Sheriff's Department examine two computer disks that were suspected of containing evidence in a homicide case.

The programs funded in this conference report safeguard our children, neighborhoods, and communities, and preserve our resources. They protect our industries, both locally and globally, and help us maintain our position as an international leader—economically, socially, and politically. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for maintaining our quality of life to and support final passage of this conference report.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of funding for the National Endowment for Democracy. Some of our colleagues have argued that NED is not necessary. I disagree. While many of NED's supporters are focusing in this debate on the importance of a strong NED presence in the republics of the former Soviet Union, and such a presence is vitally important, I would like to speak briefly about NED's significance to the Chinese prodemocracy movement.

In fiscal year 1993, NED is spending under \$1 million for all of China. The funds support a range of initiatives by exile groups and are helping to keep the light of democracy burning bright as these exile groups educate the public in China and in the United States about China's reality today. NED funds help to document human rights abuses, to provide legal support for political prisoners inside China, and to publish magazines promoting the evolution of China toward a more open and democratic society.

I submit for the RECORD a letter to Members of Congress by Fang Lizhi, a prominent Chinese dissident, in support of the National Endowment for Democracy. I would also like to include in the RECORD a letter from Liu Binyan and Su Xiaokang, directors of the Princeton China Initiative in support of NED. These letters all attest to the importance of NED funding for the China democracy movement.

Through NED, small human rights organizations in China and in other places around the world are able to carry on their courageous and important work. By supporting human rights organizations around the world, NED helps to give voice to the voiceless. The road chosen by human rights activists is often a lonely and difficult one. It is also an essential one. Human rights activists promote respect for human rights and the rule of law in fledgling democracies. They provide hope for victims of oppression and political violence and help to pave the way to a more just and peaceful world.

More than 50 small human rights groups receive assistance from the National Endowment for Democracy. They work in China, Burma, Indonesia, Vietnam and Cambodia, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Zaire, Liberia, Nigeria and Uganda, Russia, Ukraine, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Cuba. Their work is important and the contributions they receive from NED are critical to their survival. I urge my colleagues not to forsake these brave people who look to the United States for guidance. Support the funding for the National Endowment for Democracy.

The letters follow:

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA,
Tucson, AZ, June 29, 1993.

HONORABLE MEMBER: I recently heard that the National Endowment Democracy (NED) will face a close down due to the current budget cut. As a person who has been and are pursuing Chinese democracy, I would like to take this opportunity to express my opinion about this matter.

As I understand it, NED has played an important in supporting the democratic cause all over the world. The pro-democracy movements of many countries, including China, are directly encouraged by NED's efforts. It is true that the Cold War is over, but it does not mean that democracy has achieved. In fact, many countries in today's world still is ruled by an oligarchic dictatorship, still lacks freedom of speech, still has not meaningful elections, and still holds political pris-

oners. Therefore, NED's functions are still absolutely necessary for the leadership of the U.S. in the international affair.

I would also like to mention here a misleading, which has been circulating recently. It says that economic development will automatically lead to a democratic society. Especially, when the world economy now is sluggish, democracy and human rights as a basic principle in international affairs if frequently downplayed. For instance, considering the high economic growth in China in last few years, some people even argue that China now needs only economic development, because more economic growth will lead inevitably to democracy. It would be wonderful if democracy did indeed grow automatically out of economic development, but history gives us, unfortunately, no such guarantees. In the actuality of China today, the economic growth that we see has not in the slightest moved the current leaders in China to alter their autocratic rule.

I feel the need to stress this point because a world in which the principles of democracy and human rights are downplayed is a world that lengthens the time during which autocracy can survive. On the other hand, history has shown many times that a dictator who relies on massacre and suppression to maintain his rule at home is frequently untrustworthy in international affairs as well. In this area the problem of democracy is one of the world-wide problems, like that of environment. Without step-by-step improvement in the world-wide environment for human rights and democracy, one can not expect a complete solution of many international problems. Therefore, I would like to strongly recommend you, member of the legislators of the U.S., to approve the NED and its functions to work continually and effectively.

Sincerely,

FANG LIZHI,
Professor of Physics.

PRINCETON CHINA INITIATIVE,
Princeton, NJ, June 29, 1993.

The House of the Representatives and the Senate,
Washington, DC.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: We are exiled Chinese writers who have not been able to return to China after the June massacre in 1989. We have heard that the Congress is considering the possibility of abolishing the national endowment for Democracy. We are very surprised and deeply worried.

Since the 1989 Tiananmen massacre, the exile Chinese intellectual communities and democratic movements in exile abroad have been graciously supported by the U.S. government and the Congress, and the main channel for this support has been the National Endowment for Democracy. As far as he know, from the end of 1990, through the Foundation for Democracy and Human Rights in China (of which Fang Lizhi, Chia Ling and other prominent Chinese dissidents are Board members), NED has given grants to at least eight organizations to do various projects, with grants from NED, these organizations have been able to exert significant impact on Chinese politics.

For instance, Human Rights in China, which is located in New York, has been able to provide first-hand, accurate information about human rights records and cases of human rights abuse in China by using the funds provided by NED to investigate and follow up on the developments in China. This organization invited well known dissidents inside China to join its Board of Directors,

thus making a major breakthrough in the prohibition of human rights activities in China.

The Independent Federation of Chinese Students and Scholars, with ten of thousands of members in the U.S., and also supported by NED, has been very active in protecting the rights of Chinese students and scholars. They have also played an important role in providing information and testimony during the Congressional hearings on the issue of Most Favored Nation trading status for China.

With the financial help from NED, the bi-monthly magazine "Democratic China" has published regularly, furnishing information and analysis on recent developments in China to overseas Chinese readers, to the western media and to people in China through radio broadcasts in the Chinese language. "China Focus", a monthly newsletter in English published by the Princeton China Initiative, provides insiders' information and views on current events in China in a voice that is unavailable anywhere else.

Without the help from NED, the impact of these organizations and publications will be greatly diminished, and some will even cease to exist. To the exiled Chinese democracy movement which has been growing steadily since the 1989 Tiananmen Movement, the abolition of NED would be a great setback. It would have a negative impact on the whole process of China's democratization and stability.

We urgently appeal to you to continue your support of NED so that it can play an even more important role in promoting democracy in the world. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

LIU BINYAN,
Chairman, Executive
Committee.

SU XIAOKANG,
Executive Director.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 303, nays 100, answered "present" 1, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 517]

YEAS—303

Abercrombie	Baker (LA)	Bereuter
Ackerman	Barca	Berman
Andrews (ME)	Barcia	Bevill
Andrews (NJ)	Barlow	Bilbray
Andrews (TX)	Barrett (NE)	Billakis
Applegate	Barrett (WI)	Blackwell
Bacchus (FL)	Bateman	Bliley
Baessler	Becerra	Blute
Baker (CA)	Beilenson	Boehlert

Bonilla	Horn	Peterson (MN)
Bonior	Houghton	Pickett
Boucher	Hoyer	Pickle
Brewster	Hughes	Pomeroy
Brooks	Hunter	Porter
Browder	Hutchinson	Poshard
Brown (CA)	Hutto	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Hyde	Pryce (OH)
Brown (OH)	Inalee	Quillen
Bryant	Jefferson	Quinn
Byrne	Johnson (GA)	Rahall
Calvert	Johnson (SD)	Rangel
Canady	Johnson, E. B.	Ravenel
Cantwell	Johnston	Reed
Cardin	Kanjorski	Regula
Carr	Kaptur	Reynolds
Castle	Kasich	Roemer
Chapman	Kennedy	Rogers
Clay	Kennelly	Ros-Lehtinen
Clayton	Kildee	Rose
Clement	Kim	Rowland
Clinger	Klein	Roybal-Allard
Clyburn	Klecza	Rush
Coleman	Kolbe	Sabo
Collins (IL)	Kopetski	Sanders
Collins (MI)	Kreidler	Sangmeister
Cooper	Kyl	Sarpalius
Coppersmith	LaFalce	Sawyer
Costello	Lambert	Schenk
Coyne	Lancaster	Schiff
Cramer	Lantos	Schumer
Cunningham	LaRocco	Scott
Danner	Laughlin	Serrano
Darden	Lazio	Sharp
de la Garza	Leach	Shaw
Deal	Lehman	Shepherd
DeFazio	Levin	Sisisky
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Skaggs
Dellums	Linder	Skeen
Derrick	Lipinski	Skelton
Deutsch	Livingston	Slaughter
Diaz-Balart	Lloyd	Smith (IA)
Dickey	Long	Smith (NJ)
Dicks	Lowe	Smith (TX)
Dixon	Machtley	Snowe
Durbin	Maloney	Stark
Edwards (TX)	Mann	Stenholm
Emerson	Manton	Stokes
English (AZ)	Margolies-	Strickland
English (OK)	Mezvinisky	Studds
Evans	Markey	Stupak
Fazio	Martinez	Swett
Fields (LA)	Matsui	Swift
Filner	Mazzoli	Synar
Fingerhut	McCloskey	Tanner
Fish	McCollum	Tauzin
Flake	McCrery	Taylor (MS)
Foglietta	McCurdy	Tejeda
Ford (TN)	McDermott	Thomas (CA)
Fowler	McHale	Thompson
Frank (MA)	McKinney	Thornton
Frank (CT)	McNulty	Thurman
Frost	Meehan	Torkildsen
Furse	Meek	Torres
Galleghy	Menendez	Torricelli
Gallo	Mfume	Towns
Gejdenson	Mineta	Traficant
Geren	Minge	Tucker
Gibbons	Mink	Unsoeld
Gilchrest	Moakley	Valentine
Gillmor	Mollohan	Velazquez
Gilman	Montgomery	Vento
Glickman	Morella	Visclosky
Gonzalez	Murtha	Volkmmer
Goodlatte	Myers	Vucanovich
Goodling	Nadler	Walsh
Gordon	Natcher	Washington
Grandy	Neal (MA)	Waters
Green	Nussle	Watt
Gunderson	Oberstar	Waxman
Gutierrez	Obey	Wheat
Hall (OH)	Oliver	Whitten
Hall (TX)	Ortiz	Williams
Hamburg	Owens	Wilson
Hamilton	Oxley	Wise
Harman	Packard	Woolsey
Hastings	Pallone	Wyden
Hilliard	Parker	Wynn
Hinchey	Pastor	Yates
Hoagland	Payne (NJ)	Young (AK)
Hobson	Payne (VA)	Young (FL)
Hoekstra	Pelosi	
Holden	Peterson (FL)	

NAYS—100

Allard	Gingrich	Petri
Archer	Goss	Pombo
Armey	Grams	Portman
Bachus (AL)	Hancock	Ramstad
Ballenger	Hefley	Ridge
Bartlett	Hergert	Roberts
Barton	Hoke	Rohrabacher
Bentley	Huffington	Roth
Boehner	Inglis	Royce
Bunning	Inhofe	Saxton
Burton	Istook	Schaefer
Buyer	Jacobs	Schroeder
Callahan	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Camp	King	Shays
Coble	Kingston	Shuster
Collins (GA)	Klink	Slattery
Combest	Klug	Smith (MI)
Condit	Knollenberg	Smith (OR)
Conyers	Levy	Solomon
Cox	Lewis (CA)	Spence
Crane	Lewis (FL)	Stearns
Crapo	Lightfoot	Stump
DeLay	Manzullo	Sundquist
Doolittle	McCandless	Talent
Dornan	McHugh	Taylor (NC)
Dreier	McInnis	Thomas (WY)
Duncan	McKeon	Upton
Dunn	Mica	Walker
Everett	Miller (FL)	Weldon
Ewing	Molinar	Wolf
Fawell	Moorhead	Zelliff
Fields (TX)	Orton	Zimmer
Franks (NJ)	Paxon	
Gekas	Penny	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Spratt

NOT VOTING—29

Bishop	Greenwood	Michel
Borski	Hansen	Miller (CA)
Dingell	Hastert	Moran
Dooley	Hayes	Murphy
Edwards (CA)	Hefner	Neal (NC)
Engel	Hochbrueckner	Richardson
Eshoo	Johnson (CT)	Rostenkowski
Farr	McDade	Roukema
Ford (MI)	McMillan	Santorum
Gephardt	Meyers	

□ 2056

Ms. MOLINARI changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. LINDER, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 517 on H.R. 2519 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote 517, on H.R. 2519 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. Mr. Speaker, due to my being unavoidably detained on Tuesday, October 19, I was unable to record my vote on one bill. Therefore, I would like to take this opportunity to submit for the RECORD

how I would have voted had I been present: rollcall No. 517, "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on rollcall votes 510 through 517 due to the hospitalization of my wife. Had I been present, I would have voted:

On Rollcall 510, "nay."
On Rollcall 511, "yea."
On Rollcall 512, "yea."
On Rollcall 513, "yea."
On Rollcall 514, "yea."
On Rollcall 515, "nay."
On Rollcall 516, "yea."
On Rollcall 517, "yea."

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2519, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). Pursuant to House Resolution 267 the motions printed in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference to dispose of amendments in disagreement are considered as read.

The Clerk will designate the first amendment is disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 2, line 25, strike out "\$427,000,000" and insert "\$493,750,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "notwithstanding the provisions of section 511 of said Act, \$474,500,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 2100

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 3, line 5, strike out "and chapter A of subpart 2" and insert "and an additional \$50,000,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of chapter A of subpart 2".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 5, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "of part E of title I of said Act and \$50,000,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of chapter A of subpart 2".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not want to take a lot of time, but I would just like to know what is in his motion briefly. You are receding and you are accepting the Senate's position?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in some of the amendments the Senate is receding to the House and on some of the other amendments the House is receding to the Senate. There are no surprises.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. On the motions where we are receding and taking the Senate amendment, I would just like to know what is in them. Can you tell me what they are?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. They are printed in the RECORD and have been available to the Members for 5 calendar days.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, I do not have that in front of me. Is it costing more money? How much more is it? What is the number on this, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is amendment No. 5.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I would say that these motions were printed in the RECORD. We filed them Thursday night. They have been available for several days.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendments numbered 7, 11, 62, 79, 80, 99, 120, 137, and 145 be considered en bloc and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The texts of the various Senate amendments referred to in the unanimous consent request are as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 3, line 10, after "(c)" insert "an additional".

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 4, line 4, after "petitions" insert "Provided further, That funds made available in fiscal year 1994 under subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, may be obligated for pro-

grams for the prosecution of driving while intoxicated charges and the enforcement of other laws relating to alcohol use and the operation of motor vehicles.

Senate amendment No. 62: Page 26, after line 15, insert:

SEC. 109. Section 524(c)(9) of title 28, United States Code, as amended, is further amended by deleting subsection (E).

Senate amendment No. 79: Page 32, after line 14, insert:

INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, the Advanced Technology Program and the Quality Outreach Program of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, \$232,524,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$1,290,000 may be transferred to the "Working Capital Fund".

Senate amendment No. 80: Page 32, after line 14, insert:

CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH FACILITIES

For construction of new research facilities, including architectural and engineering design, not otherwise provided for the National Institute of Standards and Technology, as authorized by 15 U.S.C. 278c-278e, \$61,686,000, to remain available until expended.

Senate amendment No. 99: Page 40, line 15, after "works" insert "for the provision of educational, cultural, health care, public information, public safety or other social services".

Senate amendment No. 120: Page 49, line 17, after "expended" insert "of which \$28,877,000 shall be available for the United States Merchant Marine Academy and \$10,344,000 shall be available for State maritime academy programs".

Senate amendment No. 137: Page 56, line 19, after "Service" insert "not otherwise provided for".

Senate amendment No. 145: Page 59, line 17, after "1974." insert "In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program, \$183,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the Salaries and Expenses account under Administration of Foreign Affairs."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 11, 62, 79, 80, 99, 120, 137, and 145, and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Amendment No. 7 says:

Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which adds the words "an additional," which were not in the House bill. This language clarifies the intent of the conferees that the \$25 million in discretionary grants designated for Community Policing is in addition to the \$50 million provided for the Byrne discretionary program.

Am I to understand that is \$25 million more?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That makes the \$25 million for the Community Policing Program in addition to the \$50 million available in the Byrne program for discretionary grants.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. It is not additional money?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It is in addition to the amount of money for the Byrne discretionary grant program.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. So that is \$25 million more?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes. But we took that into consideration when we set the other figure too. We looked at the total for the Byrne program and added \$25 million for community policing.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. You are saying that the \$25 million came from some other source within the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Within the total amount for the bill, that is right.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. So it is not \$25 million additional to what was already appropriated for that?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. No.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10: Page 3, line 16, strike out all after "4824);" down to and including "agencies" in line 24, and insert "and (e) an additional \$25,000,000 shall be available pursuant to the provisions of chapter A of subpart 2 of part E of title I of said Act, for criminal records upgrade projects, including \$10,000,000 for reimbursement to the Federal Bureau of Investigation".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion. The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

(e) \$16,000,000 shall be available to reimburse any appropriation account, as designated by the Attorney General, for selected costs incurred by State and local law enforcement agencies which enter into cooperative agreements to conduct joint law enforcement operations with Federal agencies; (f) \$500,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of subtitle B of title I of the Anti Car Theft Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-519), notwithstanding the provisions of section 131(b)(2) of said Act, for grants to be used in combating motor vehicle theft: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$12,500,000 of the funds made available in fiscal year 1994 under chapter A of subpart 2 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, shall be available as follows: (a) \$2,000,000 shall be available for

the activities of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Area Drug Enforcement Task Force; (b) not to exceed \$10,000,000 shall be available to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for start-up costs associated with coordinating the national background check system; and (c) \$500,000 shall be transferred to the National Commission to Support Law Enforcement for the necessary expenses of the Commission as authorized by section 211(B) of Public Law 101-515.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 5, line 17, strike out "(f) \$600,000" and insert "(d) \$5,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: (f) \$500,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 6, line 6, strike out "\$117,196,000" and insert "\$115,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert: \$119,000,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: page 6, line 12, strike out "\$30,898,000" and insert "\$30,723,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "\$30,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 8, line 5, strike out "\$400,968,000" and insert "\$400,086,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert "\$403,968,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 9, line 17, strike out "\$63,817,000" and insert "\$62,092,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert "\$66,817,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 31: Page 10, line 2, strike out "\$44,817,000" and insert "\$43,092,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "\$45,997,000", and on page 9 line 19 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike "\$19,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$20,820,000", and on page 10 line 3 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike "\$19,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$20,820,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 34: Page 11, line 10, strike out "\$56,521,000" and insert "\$46,150,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "\$61,513,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 37: Page 11, line 23, strike out "\$56,521,000" and insert "\$46,150,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "\$61,513,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 44: Page 15, line 4, strike out "\$60,275,000" and insert "\$58,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 44, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "\$55,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 52: Page 19, line 16, after "1996" insert "for projects on the northern border of the United States only".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following:

for projects on the northern border of the United States only.

In addition, section 286 of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U.S.C. 1356), as amended, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking "\$5", and inserting "\$6"; and

(2) in subsection (h)(2)(A), by deleting subsection (v), and inserting the following:

"(v) providing detention and deportation services for: excludable aliens arriving on commercial aircraft and vessels; and any alien who is excludable under section 212(a) who has attempted illegal entry into the United States through avoidance of immigration inspection at air or sea ports-of-entry.

"(vi) providing exclusion and asylum proceedings at air or sea ports-of-entry for: excludable aliens arriving on commercial aircraft and vessels including immigration exclusion proceedings resulting from presentation of fraudulent documents and failure to present documentation; and any alien who is excludable under section 212(a) who has attempted illegal entry into the United States through avoidance of immigration inspection at air or sea ports-of-entry."

IMMIGRATION EMERGENCY FUND

For the Immigration Emergency Fund, as authorized by section 404(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U.S.C. 1101), \$6,000,000 to remain available until expended

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 63: Page 26, after line 15, insert:

SEC. 110. During fiscal year 1994, from funds appropriated to the Department of Justice, the Attorney General may enter into reimbursable agreements with the Federal Judicial Branch, or reimburse a State or local government, if applicable, for the cost of

managing prisoners or detainees, who are in the custody of the Attorney General, in a home confinement, electronic monitoring, or other such less costly alternative to incarceration when a Federal judicial official has determined this course of confinement to be viable and practicable: *Provided*, That this section shall not be applied in any way which is inconsistent with Federal law under titles 18 and 21, United States Code, including Federal sentencing guidelines and law related to minimum mandatory sentences.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed in said amendment, insert the following:

SEC. 110. Technical Amendments to the Victims of Crime Act.—

(a) Section 1402 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10601), is amended—

(1) In subsection (d)(2)—

(A) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (A);

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) 1 percent shall be available for grants under section 1404(c); and

"(D) 4.5 percent shall be available for grants as provided in section 1404A."

(2) In subsection (d)(3), by striking "1404(a)" and inserting "1404A".

(3) In subsection (g)(1), by striking "(d)(2)(A)(iv)" and inserting "(d)(2)(D)".

(b) Section 1404A of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10603(a)), is amended by striking "1402(d)(2)" and inserting "1402(d)(2)(D) and (d)(3)".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 64: Page 26, after line 15, insert:

SEC. 111. (a) 28 United States Code 1930(a)(1) is amended by striking "\$120" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$135"; and

(b) 28 United States Code 589 is amended in subsection (b), subparagraph (1) by striking "one-fourth" and inserting in lieu thereof "22.2 per centum", and in subsection (f), paragraph (2) by inserting after the word "title" the following:

""; and

"(3) 11.1 per centum of the fees collected under section 1930(a)(1) of this title".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In

lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

SEC. 111. Bankruptcy Fees.—

(a) Chapters 7 and 13 Filing Fees.—Effective 30 days after enactment of this Act—

(1) Section 1930(a)(1) of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by striking "\$120" and inserting "\$130".

(2) Section 589a of title 28 of the United States Code is amended in subsection (b)(1), by striking "one-fourth" and inserting "23.08 percentum".

(3) SEC. 406. (b) of Public Law 101-162 (103 Stat. 1016) is amended by striking "25 percent", and inserting "30.76 percentum".

(b) Chapter 11 Filing Fee.—Effective 30 days after enactment of this Act—

(1) Section 1930(a)(3) of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by striking "\$600" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$800".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

(2) Section 589a of title 28 of the United States Code is amended in subsection (b)(2), by striking "50 percentum" and inserting "37.5 percentum".

(3) Section 589a of title 28 of the United States Code is amended in subsection (f)(1), by striking "16.7 percentum" and inserting "12.5 percentum".

(4) Sec. 406.(b) of Public Law 101-162 (103 Stat. 1016) is amended by adding "and 25 percent of the fees hereafter collected under 28 U.S.C. section 1930(a)(3)" immediately after "28 U.S.C. section 1930(a)(1)".

(c) No funds provided by this Act shall be expended to fill any bankruptcy judgeship unless such appointee was on a merit selection list or report submitted to the court of appeals by either the judicial council or a subcommittee of the members of the council, in accordance with section 120 of the Bankruptcy Amendments and Federal Judgeship Act of 1984 (Public Law 98-353; 98 Stat. 344), section 152 of title 28 of the United States Code, and the Judicial Conference of the United States Procedures for the Selection and Appointment of Bankruptcy Judges.

(d) Report on Bankruptcy Fees.—

(1) Report Required.—Not later than March 31, 1998, the Judicial Conference of the United States shall submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate, a report relating to the bankruptcy fee system and the impact of such system on various participants in bankruptcy cases.

(2) Contents of Report.—Such report shall include—

(A)(i) an estimate of the costs and benefits that would result from waiving bankruptcy fees payable by debtors who are individuals, and

(ii) recommendations regarding various revenue sources to offset the net cost of waiving such fees.

(B)(i) an evaluation of the effects that would result in cases under chapters 11 and 13 of title 11, United States Code, from using a graduated bankruptcy fee system based on assets, liabilities, or both of the debtor, and

(ii) recommendations regarding various methods to implement such a graduated bankruptcy fee system.

(3) Waiver of Fees in Selected Districts.—For purposes of carrying out paragraphs (1) and (2), the Judicial Conference of the United States shall carry out in not more than six judicial districts, throughout the 3-year period beginning on October 1, 1994, a program under which fees payable under section 1930 of title 28, United States Code, may be

waived in cases under chapter 7 of title 11, United States Code, for debtors who are individuals unable to pay such fees in installments.

(4) Study of Graduated Fee System.—For purposes of carrying out paragraphs (1) and (2), the Judicial Conference of the United States shall carry out, in not fewer than six judicial districts, a study to estimate the results that would occur in cases under chapters 11 and 13 of title 11, United States Code, if filing fees payable under section 1930 of title 28, United States Code, were paid on a graduated scale based on assets, liabilities, or both of the debtor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 67: Page 26, after line 15, insert:

SEC. 114. Section 504(f) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, is amended by inserting the following after "task forces," "gang task forces, and for programs or projects to abate drug activity in residential and commercial buildings through community participation."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

SEC. 112. For fiscal year 1994 only, grants awarded to State and local governments for the purpose of participating in gang task forces and for programs or projects to abate drug activity in residential and commercial buildings through community participation, shall be exempt from the provisions of section 504(f) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 71: Page 28, line 16, after "studies" insert: "Provided, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to repeal, to retroactively apply changes in, or to continue a reexamination of, the policies of the Federal Communications Commission with respect to comparative licensing, distress sales and tax certificates granted under 26 U.S.C. 1071, to expand minority ownership of broadcasting licenses, including those established in the Statement of Policy on Minority Ownership of Broadcasting Facilities, 68 F.C.C. 2d 979 and 60 F.C.C. 2d 1591, as amended 52 R.R. 2d 1313 (1982) and Mid-Florida Television Corp., 69 F.C.C. 2d 607 (Rev. Bd. 1978), which were effective prior to September 12, 1986, other than to close MM Docket No. 86-484 with a reinstatement of prior policy and a lifting of suspension of any sales, licenses, applica-

tions, or proceedings, which were suspended pending the conclusion of the inquiry: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated to the Federal Communications Commission by this Act may be used to diminish the number of VHF channel assignments reserved for noncommercial educational television stations in the Television Table of Assignments (section 73.606 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations); *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act be used to repeal, to retroactively apply changes in, or to begin or continue a reexamination of the rules and the policies established to administer such rules of the Federal Communications Commission as set forth at section 73.3555(c) of title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. Smith of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Smith of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

: *Provided*, That \$60,400,000 of offsetting collections shall be assessed and collected pursuant to section 9 of title I of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 1994, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1994 appropriation estimated at not more than \$99,900,000: *Provided further*, That any offsetting collections received in excess of \$60,400,000 in fiscal year 1994 shall remain available until expended, but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1994: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to repeal, to retroactively apply changes in, or to continue a reexamination of, the policies of the Federal Communications Commission with respect to comparative licensing, distress sales and tax certificates granted under 26 U.S.C. 1071, to expand minority ownership of broadcasting licenses, including those established in the Statement of Policy on Minority Ownership of Broadcasting Facilities, 68 F.C.C. 2d 979 and 69 F.C.C. 2d 1591, as amended 52 R.R. 2d 1313 (1982) and Mid-Florida Television Corp., 69 F.C.C. 2d 607 (Rev. Bd. 1978), which were effective prior to September 12, 1986, other than to close MM Docket No. 86-484 with a reinstatement of prior policy and a lifting of suspension of any sales, licenses, applications, or proceedings, which were suspended pending the conclusion of the inquiry: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated to the Federal Communications Commission by this Act may be used to diminish the number of VHF channel assignments reserved for noncommercial educational television stations in the Televisions Table of Assignments (section 73.606 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations); *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to repeal, to retroactively apply changes in, or to begin or continue a reexamination of the rules and the policies established to administer such rules of the Federal Communications Commission as set forth at section 73.3555(d) of title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations, other than to amend policies

with respect to waivers of the portion of section 73.355(d) that concerns cross-ownership of a daily newspaper and an AM or FM radio broadcast station.

In addition, section 9(a) of Title I of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(a) by striking "(a) General Authority.—" and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) General Authority.—

"(1) Recovery of Costs.—"; and

(b) By adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) Fees Contingent on Appropriations.— The fees described in paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be collected only if, and only in the total amounts, required in Appropriations Acts."

and on page 28, line 14 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike "\$129,889,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$160,300,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 73: Page 30, line 4, after "2282-2285" insert "Provided further, That the funds appropriated in this paragraph are subject to the limitations and provisions of sections 10(a) and 10(c) (notwithstanding section 10(e)), 11(b), 18, and 20 of the Federal Trade Commission Improvements Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-252; 94 Stat. 374)".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

Provided further, That the funds appropriated in this paragraph are subject to the limitations and provisions of sections 10(a) and 10(c) (notwithstanding section 10(e)), 11(b), 18, and 20 of the Federal Trade Commission Improvements Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-252; 94 Stat. 374), except that this proviso shall cease to be effective upon enactment of an Act authorizing appropriations for the Federal Trade Commission for fiscal year 1994

And on page 29, line 11 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike "\$19,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$20,820,000".

And on page 29, line 21 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike "\$69,740,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$67,920,000".

And on page 29, line 22 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike "\$19,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$20,820,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 75: Page 31, line 12, after "subsistence" insert "Provided, That

immediately upon enactment of this Act, the rate of fees under section 6(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77f(b)) shall increase from one-fiftieth of 1 per centum to one twenty-ninth of 1 per centum and such increase shall be deposited as an offsetting collection to this appropriation to recover costs of services of the securities registration process: *Provided further*, That such fees shall remain available until expended".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

Provided, That immediately upon enactment of this Act, the rate of fees under section 6(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77f(b)) shall increase from one-fiftieth of 1 per centum to one-twenty-ninth of 1 per centum and such increase shall be deposited as an offsetting collection to this appropriation, to remain available until expended, to recover costs of services of the securities registration process: *Provided further*, That such fee increase shall be repealed upon enactment of legislation amending the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to establish a new fee system in fiscal year 1994 for full cost recovery of Commission expenses.

In addition, and subject to enactment of legislation amending the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to establish a new fee system in fiscal year 1994 to require the Commission to collect \$171,621,000 in fees to be deposited to this appropriation as an offsetting collection; \$171,621,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That subject to the fee provisions contained in said legislation, \$171,621,000 of fees shall be assessed and deposited as an offsetting collection to this appropriation to recover the costs of services of the securities registration process: *Provided further*, That the \$171,621,000 herein appropriated shall be reduced as the aforementioned fees are collected during fiscal year 1994, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1994 appropriation estimated at not more than \$0.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 78: Page 32, line 14, after "Fund" insert "and \$3,000,000 may be transferred to the Department of Commerce 'Working Capital Fund'".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$1,500,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 81: Page 33, line 3, strike out all after "8831;" down to and including "Fisheries" in line 7 and insert "\$1,685,000,000, to remain available until expended; of which \$600,000 shall be available for operational expenses and cooperative agreements at the Fish Farming Experimental Laboratory at Stuttgart, Arkansas, and of which \$10,000,000 shall be available for NOAA-wide efforts to conduct research on coastal development and population growth-associated problems, seafood safety, and remediation of environmental contamination and habitat restoration, including joint pilot projects between the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Institute of Standards and Technology to apply advanced sensor and environmental technologies for such purposes, particularly at military installations slated for closure; and in addition, \$54,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the fund entitled "Promote and Develop Fishery Products and Research Pertaining to American Fisheries": *Provided*, That grants to States pursuant to section 306 and 306(a) of the Coastal Zone Management Act, as amended, shall not exceed \$2,000,000 and shall not be less than \$500,000: *Provided further*, That in applying provisions of section 606 of this Act to the programs, projects, and activities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the notification requirements of section 606 shall apply to the proposed reprogramming of funds in excess of \$250,000 or 5 per centum, whichever is less, for each program, project, or activity: *Provided further*, That hereafter all receipts received from the sale of aeronautical charts that result from an increase in the price of individual charts above the level in effect for such charts on September 30, 1993, shall be deposited in this account as an offsetting collection and shall be available for obligation".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

\$1,694,753,000 to remain available until expended; of which \$576,000 shall be available for operational expenses and cooperative agreements at the Fish Farming Experimental Laboratory at Stuttgart, Arkansas; and in addition, \$54,800,000 shall be derived by transfer from the fund entitled "Promote and Develop Fishery Products and Research Pertaining to American Fisheries": *Provided*, That grants to States pursuant to section 306 and 306(a) of the Coastal Zone Management Act, as amended, shall not exceed \$2,000,000 and shall not be less than \$500,000: *Provided further*, That hereafter all receipts received from the sale of aeronautical charts that result from an increase in the price of individual charts above the level in effect for such

charts on September 30, 1993, shall be deposited in this account as an offsetting collection and shall be available for obligation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 2110

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 84: Page 33, after line 26, insert:

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT AND MODERNIZATION
For construction, procurement and modification of aircraft, including research equipment and spare parts, necessary to acquire the next generation aircraft reconnaissance system for hurricane and severe storm forecasting and atmospheric research, \$46,000,000, to remain available until expended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$43,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is \$43 million more than the House, for this section? This was zero when it left the House was it not?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, these funds are for the NOAA hurricane plane. They have had a great need for some time for a plane that would fly higher and faster to locate these hurricanes farther out and to provide better data to forecast the hurricanes' landfall.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Further reserving the right to object, could the gentleman tell me why there was no money in this in the House version when it went to the Senate?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It was not specifically authorized, it was not in the President's budget request, and we became aware of the need for the plane after the House considered this bill.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. It was not authorized?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is right, not specifically authorized.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] objects. The Chair will have to put the

question on the motion as a result of the objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Is the Chair talking about putting the question and either having a rollcall vote tonight—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will repeat the question.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if the Chair puts the question, then he is saying that there probably would have to be a vote either verbal or rollcall tonight?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, let me reserve the right to object.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Many of our colleagues are very interested in this provision. In fact, on the House side, several Members talked to me about this need of an airplane for hurricane spotting.

So I would hope the gentleman would not object to this.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, the only problem that I have is it is \$43 million that was not authorized. It went to the Senate and was put in. And we had zeroed it. There was zero for it, as I understand.

Mr. ROGERS. If the gentleman would further yield, unfortunately, the need for this plane was not identified until after the House passed their bill, and well after the administration had submitted their budget request.

I would point out to the gentleman, that much of this bill is not authorized, including many important programs. Yet we still provide funding because of the importance of these programs.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Further reserving the right to object, I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. As a matter of fact, two-thirds of this bill is not authorized. So when Mr. ROGERS and I came to the floor, previously, we came without a rule. Anybody could object to anything they wanted to at the time. But we did not include many unauthorized matters, and where we did, any one Member could have knocked them out on a point of order. But we purposely did not include a lot of unauthorized items. The Senate provided the funding after hearing testimony on the need for this plane.

Mr. ROGERS. If the gentleman would yield further—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise Members that the ongoing colloquy is considered a continuation of the gentleman from Indiana's reservation of the right to object.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman further yield briefly?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, what the chairman has said is that some important programs in NOAA were not yet authorized when our appropriations bill came to the floor of the House.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. But it had been authorized in the Senate.

Mr. ROGERS. The funding was not specifically authorized in the Senate, but it was the Senate that added the funding.

When we go to conference then, we try to accommodate the House and the Senate. This add was for the airplane that many House Members supported. So it is not unusual for you to find items in this conference report that were not authorized by the House.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I understand. But the authorizing committee in the House, what the gentleman is saying, never got their authorizing bill completed before the appropriations process took place.

Mr. ROGERS. Exactly.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. So it should be brought to the attention of the House that the authorizing committee did not do its job in a timely fashion.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman can say that.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 93: Page 38, after line 19, insert:

United States Travel and Tourism
Administration

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Travel and Tourism Administration including travel and tourism promotional activities abroad for travel to the United States and its possessions without regard to 44 U.S.C. 501, 3702 and 3703, including employment of American citizens and aliens by contract for services abroad; rental of space abroad for periods not exceeding five years, and expenses of alteration, repair, or improvement; purchase or construction of temporary demountable exhibition structures for use abroad; advance of funds under contracts abroad; payment of tort claims in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of 28 U.S.C. 2672, when such claims arise in foreign countries; and not to exceed \$15,000 for official representation expenses abroad;

\$20,298,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$2,500,000 is to provide financial assistance under section 203(a) of the International Travel Act of 1961, as amended, notwithstanding the provisions of section 203(f)(1) of such Act: *Provided further*, That in addition to fees currently being assessed and collected, the Administration shall charge users of its services, products, and information, fees sufficient to result in an additional \$3,000,000, to be deposited in the General Fund of the Treasury.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

UNITED STATES TRAVEL AND TOURISM
ADMINISTRATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Travel and Tourism Administration including travel and tourism promotional activities abroad for travel to the United States and its possessions without regard to 44 U.S.C. 501, 3702 and 3703, including employment of American citizens and aliens by contract for services abroad; rental of space abroad for periods not exceeding five years, and expenses of alteration, repair, or improvement; purchase or construction of temporary demountable exhibition structures for use abroad; advance of funds under contracts abroad; payment of tort claims in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of 28 U.S.C. 2672, when such claims arise in foreign countries; and not to exceed \$15,000 for official representation expenses abroad; \$17,120,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated by this paragraph shall be available to carry out the provisions of section 203(a) of the International Travel Act of 1961, as amended: *Provided further*, That in addition to fees currently being assessed and collected, the Administration shall charge users of its services, products, and information, fees sufficient to result in an additional \$3,000,000, to be deposited in the General Fund of the Treasury.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 97: Page 40, line 4, after "year" insert ": *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of sections 391 and 392 of the Communications Act, as amended, not to exceed \$1,000,000 appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for the Pan-Pacific Educational and Cultural Experiments by Satellite program (PEACESAT): *Provided further*, That \$500,000 shall be available for the American Indian Higher Education Consortium for utilization of telecommunications technologies".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert ": *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of sections 391 and 392 of the Communications Act, as amended, not to exceed \$700,000 appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for the Pan-Pacific Education and Cultural Experiments by Satellite program (PEACESAT)".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 101: Page 40, after line 22, insert:

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE
PROGRAMS

For grants for economic development assistance as provided by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, Public Law 91-304, and such laws that were in effect immediately before September 30, 1982, \$242,642,000, of which \$13,720,000 shall be for Trade Adjustment Assistance: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this heading may be used directly or indirectly for attorneys' or consultants' fees in connection with securing grants and contracts made by the Economic Development Administration.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE
PROGRAMS

For grants for economic development assistance as provided by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, Public Law 91-304, and such laws that were in effect immediately before September 30, 1982, and for trade adjustment assistance, \$322,642,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this heading may be used directly or indirectly for attorneys' or consultants' fees in connection with securing grants and contracts made by the Economic Development Administration: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Commerce may provide financial assistance for projects to be located on military installations closed or scheduled for closure or realignment to grantees eligible for assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, without it being required that the grantee have title or ability to obtain a lease for the property, for the useful life of the project, when, in the opin-

ion of the Secretary of Commerce, such financial assistance is necessary for the economic development of the area: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of commerce may, as the Secretary considers appropriate, consult with the Secretary of Defense regarding the title to land on military installations closed or scheduled for closure or realignment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 110: Page 44, line 16, strike out "\$2,063,000" and insert "\$2,075,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$2,160,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 111: Page 45, line 13, strike out "\$297,252,000" and insert "\$286,170,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$280,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 113: Page 45, line 14, after "3006A(i)" insert ": *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$11,524,000 shall be available for Death Penalty Resource Centers".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named by said amendment, insert "\$19,800,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 114: Page 46, line 10, strike out "\$84,500,000" and insert "\$80,952,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$86,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 115: Page 46, line 24, strike out "\$44,612,000" and insert "\$43,358,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$44,900,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 122: Page 51, line 12, strike out "\$900,000" and insert "\$500,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: \$1,118,000, of

which \$500,000 shall be available by transfer from unobligated balances remaining from the appropriation entitled "Commission on Agricultural Workers, Salaries and expenses".

And on page 51 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, after the heading "Salaries and Expenses" on line 9, insert the following new heading "(including transfer of funds)".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 129: Page 53, line 18, strike out all after "Act." down to and including line 22.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment amended to read as follows:

None of the funds appropriated for the Small Business Administration under this Act may be used to impose any new or increased loan guaranty fee or debenture guaranty fee, or any new or increased user fee or management assistance fee, except as otherwise provided in this Act: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided in this or any other Act may be used for the cost of direct loans to any borrower under section 7(b) of the Small Business Act to relocate voluntarily outside the business area in which the disaster has occurred.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 130: Page 54, line 4, strike out "\$22,994,000" and insert "\$21,032,000, of which \$5,135,000 shall be available until expended for the Microloan program".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "\$16,946,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 132: Page 54, line 15, strike out "\$75,000,000" and insert "\$65,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

Delete the matter stricken and delete the matter inserted and strike all on line 14, page 54 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, and all that follows through "In addition," on line 24, page 54, and on page 53, line 12 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike "this amount" and insert in lieu thereof "the total amount in this paragraph".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 133: Page 55, after line 2, insert:

In addition, for the cost of emergency disaster loans and associated administrative expenses, \$75,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That these funds, or any portion thereof, shall be available beginning in fiscal year 1994 to the extent that the President notifies the Congress of his designation of any or all of these amounts as emergency requirements under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990: *Provided further*, That Congress hereby designates these amounts as emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D).

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 133, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$140,000,000", and on page 55, line 6 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike "12,369,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 135: Page 56, after line 2, insert:

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION
PAYMENT TO THE LEGAL SERVICES
CORPORATION

For payment to the Legal Services Corporation to carry out the purposes of the

Legal Services Corporation Act of 1974, as amended, \$349,000,000; of which \$298,904,000 is for basic field programs; \$7,826,000 is for Native American programs; \$10,808,000 is for migrant programs; \$1,226,000 is for law school clinics; \$1,113,000 is for supplemental field programs; \$695,000 is for regional training centers; \$8,056,000 is for national support; \$9,236,000 is for State support; \$963,000 is for the Clearinghouse; \$569,000 is for computer assisted legal research regional centers; \$9,555,000 is for Corporation management and administration; and \$49,000 is for board initiatives.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 135, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

For payment to the Legal Services Corporation to carry out the purposes of the Legal Services Corporation Act of 1974, as amended, \$400,000,000; of which \$341,865,000 is for basic field programs; \$8,950,000 is for Native American programs; \$12,759,000 is for migrant programs; \$1,402,000 is for law school clinics; \$1,274,000 is for supplemental field programs; \$795,000 is for regional training centers; \$9,611,000 is for national support; \$10,564,000 is for State support; \$1,101,000 is for the Clearinghouse; \$651,000 is for computer assisted legal research regional centers; \$10,928,000 is for Corporation management and administration; and \$100,000 is for board initiatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 138: Page 57, line 2, strike out "\$1,612,206,000" and insert "\$1,653,184,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 138, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,704,589,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 139: Page 57, line 16, after "2718(a)" insert "and for expenses of general administration."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 139, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "and for expenses of general administration: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 502 of this Act, not to exceed 20 percent of the amounts made available in this Act in the appropriation accounts, "Diplomatic and Consular Programs" and "Salaries and Expenses" under the heading "Administration of Foreign Affairs" may be transferred between such appropriation accounts: *Provided further*, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 140: Page 57, line 23, strike out "\$481,416,000" and insert "\$455,816,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 140, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$396,722,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 2120

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 141: Page 58, line 3, strike out "\$3,800,000" and insert "\$3,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

Delete the matter stricken and delete the matter inserted, and strike all on line 24, page 57 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, and all that follows through line 3, page 58.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 142: Page 58, line 25, strike out "\$381,481,000" and insert "\$410,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 142, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$410,000,000, of which \$10,000,000 is for relocation and renovation costs necessary to facilitate the consolidation of overseas financial and administrative activities in the United States".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments numbered 147 and 148 be passed over this evening and that they be considered tomorrow, Wednesday, October 20, 1993, immediately prior to the consideration of amendment No. 171.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 149: Page 60, line 6, strike out "\$20,892,000" and insert "\$21,992,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 149, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

Delete the matter stricken and delete the matter inserted, and on line 5, page 60 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike "or" and all that follows through "arrearages" on line 7.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 150: Page 60, line 7, after "arrearages" insert "Provided, That

funds shall be available for peacekeeping expenses only upon a certification by the Secretary of State to the appropriate committees of the Congress that American manufacturers and suppliers are being given opportunities to provide equipment, services and material for United Nations peacekeeping activities equal to those being given to foreign manufacturers and suppliers, and that the United States Mission to the United Nations has established procedures to provide information on all United Nations procurement regulations and solicitations to American manufacturers and suppliers".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 150, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert "Provided, That funds shall be available for peacekeeping expenses only upon a certification by the Secretary of State to the appropriate committees of the Congress that American manufacturers and suppliers are being given opportunities to provide equipment, services and material for United Nations peacekeeping activities equal to those being given to foreign manufacturers and suppliers".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 159: Page 63, after line 12, insert:

SEC. 503. No funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act or any other Act may be expended for the salary of the United States Commissioner of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Canada.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 159, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 503. Funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act or any other Act may be expended for compensation of the United States Commissioner of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Canada, only for actual hours worked by such Commissioner.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 161: Page 63, line 20, strike out "\$47,279,000" and insert "\$58,000,000, of which \$14,000,000 is available only for payment of United States contributions to the Preparatory Commission for the Organization on the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 161, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "\$53,500,000, of which not less than \$9,500,000 is available until expended only for payment of United States contributions to the Preparatory Commission for the Organization on the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 162: Page 63, after line 20, insert:

BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING
GRANTS AND EXPENSES

For expenses of the Board for International Broadcasting, including grants to Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, Incorporated, as authorized by the Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2871-2883), \$206,000,000, of which not to exceed \$52,000 may be made available for official reception and representation expenses.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 162, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum "\$206,000,000" named in said amendment, insert "\$210,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 166: Page 67, line 1, strike out "\$217,650,000" and insert "\$250,702,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 166, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "to include other educational and cultural exchange programs, \$242,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 169: Page 68, after line 19, insert:

BROADCASTING TO CUBA

For expenses necessary to enable the United States Information Agency to carry out the Radio Broadcasting to Cuba Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1465 et seq.) (providing for the Radio Marti Program or Cuba Service of the Voice of America), and the Television Broadcasting to Cuba Act (22 U.S.C. 1465aa et seq.) including the purchase, rent, construction, and improvement of facilities for radio and television transmission and reception, and purchase and installation of necessary equipment for radio and television transmission and reception as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 1471, \$28,351,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 1477b(a): Provided, That such funds for television broadcasting to Cuba may be used to purchase or lease, maintain, and operate such aircraft (including aerostats) as may be required to house and operate necessary television broadcasting equipment.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 169, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

BROADCASTING TO CUBA

RADIO BROADCASTING TO CUBA

For expenses necessary to enable the United States Information Agency to carry out the Radio Broadcasting to Cuba Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1465 et seq.) (providing for the Radio Marti Program or Cuba Service of the Voice of America), including the purchase, rent, construction, and improvement of facilities for radio transmission and reception and purchase and installation of necessary equipment for radio transmission and reception as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 1471, \$14,000,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 1477b(a), of which \$5,000,000 shall be withheld from obligation until 30 days after the Director of the United States Information Agency submits a report to Congress which certifies receipt of the report of the Advisory Panel on Radio Marti and TV Marti and specifies the measures the United States Information Agency is taking with respect to the recommendations of the panel.

TELEVISION BROADCASTING TO CUBA

For expenses necessary to enable the United States Information Agency to carry out the Television Broadcasting to Cuba Act (22 U.S.C. 1465aa et seq.), including the purchase, rent, construction, and improvement

of facilities for television transmission and reception, and purchase and installation of necessary equipment for television transmission and reception, \$7,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not later than July 1, 1994, the Director of the United States Information Agency shall submit to Congress, after consulting with the Board for International Broadcasting and after taking into account any relevant recommendations of the Advisory Panel on Radio Marti and TV Marti, his recommendations as to whether TV Marti broadcasting is technically sound and effective and is consistently being received by a sufficient Cuban audience to warrant its continuation and whether the interests of the United States are better served by maintaining television broadcasting to Cuba, by terminating television broadcasting to Cuba and strengthening radio broadcasting to Cuba, or by funding other activities related to promoting democracy in Cuba authorized by law: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated in this paragraph, \$2,500,000 shall be withheld from obligation until after July 1, 1994, and, after that date, funds shall be available only for the orderly termination of television broadcasting to Cuba unless the Director of the United States Information Agency determines, in the report to Congress called for in the Administrative Provision Establishing the Advisory Panel on Radio Marti and TV Marti, that maintaining television broadcasting to Cuba is technically sound and effective, is consistently being received by a sufficient Cuban audience to warrant its continuation, and is in the best interests of the United States.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION ESTABLISHING THE ADVISORY PANEL ON RADIO MARTI AND TV MARTI

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established an advisory panel to be known as the Advisory Panel on Radio Marti and TV Marti (in this section referred to as the "Panel").

(b) **FUNCTIONS.**—The Panel shall study the purposes, policies, and practices of radio and television broadcasting to Cuba (commonly referred to as "Radio Marti" and "TV Marti") by the Cuba Service of the Voice of America.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the members of the Panel have been appointed pursuant to subsection (d), the Panel shall submit to the Congress and the United States Information Agency (USIA) a report which shall contain—

(1) a statement of the findings and conclusions of the Panel on the matters described in subsection (b); and

(2) specific findings and recommendations with respect to whether—

(A) such broadcasting consistently meets the standards for quality and objectivity established by law or by the United States Information Agency;

(B) such broadcasting is cost-effective;

(C) the extent to which such broadcasting is already being received by the Cuban people on a daily basis from credible sources;

(D) TV Marti broadcasting is technically sound and effective and is consistently being received by a sufficient Cuban audience to warrant its continuation;

(d) **COMPOSITION.**—(1) Panel shall be composed of three members, who shall among them have expertise in government information and broadcasting programs, broadcast journalism, journalistic ethics, and the technical aspects of radio and television broadcasting.

(2) The Director of the United States Information Agency shall appoint the members of

the Panel not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. Individuals appointed to the Panel shall be noted for their integrity, expertise, and independence of judgment consistent with the purposes of the Panel.

(3) Each member of the Panel shall be appointed for the life of the Panel. A vacancy in the Panel shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(4) Each member of the Panel shall serve without pay, except that such member shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with Sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(e) **TEMPORARY PERSONNEL.**—(1) The Panel may procure temporary and intermittent services under Section 3109 (b) of title 5, United States Code (relating to employment of experts and consultants), at rates for individuals not to exceed the maximum rate of basic pay payable for GS-15 of the General Schedule.

(2) Upon request of the Panel, the head of any Federal agency may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of the agency to the Panel to assist it in carrying out its duties under this section.

(3) **Support Services.**—The United States Information Agency shall provide facilities, supplies, and support services to the Panel upon request.

(f) **TERMINATION.**—The Panel shall terminate immediately upon submitting its report pursuant to subsection (c).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 170: Page 68, strike out lines 20 to 25.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 170, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

NORTH/SOUTH CENTER

To enable the Director of the United States Information Agency to provide for carrying out the provisions of the North/South Center Act of 1991, (22 U.S.C. 2075), by grant to an educational institution in Florida known as the North/South Center, \$8,700,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds appropriated by this Act for the United States Information Agency and the Department of State may be obligated and expended at the rate of operations and under the terms and conditions provided by H.R. 2519 as enacted into law, notwithstanding section 701 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 and section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 except that this proviso shall cease to be effective after April 30, 1994 or upon enactment into law of H.R. 2333, the State Department, USIA, and Related Agencies Authorization

Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 or similar legislation, whichever first occurs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair rules that further consideration of this bill will continue tomorrow.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 18, 1993.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Monday, October 18, 1993 at 4:30 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President wherein he transmits a report on additional measures with respect to the national emergency with the Republic of Haiti.

With great respect, I am
Sincerely yours,

DONALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

EXECUTIVE ORDER WITH RESPECT TO NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH HAITI—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. section 1703(b), and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. section 1631, I hereby report that I have again exercised my statutory authority to issue an Executive order with respect to Haiti that, effective 11:59 p.m., e.d.t., Monday, October 18, 1993, that:

(a) Blocks all property in the United States or within the possession or control of United States persons, including their overseas branches, of persons:

(1) who have contributed to the obstruction of the implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 841 and 873, the Governor's Island Agreement of July 3, 1993, or the activities of the United Nations Mission in Haiti;

(2) who have perpetuated or contributed to the violence in Haiti; or

(3) who have materially or financially supported any of the foregoing; and

(b) Prohibits any transaction subject to U.S. jurisdiction that evades or avoids, or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, the prohibitions in the new order, or in Executive Orders Nos. 12775, 12779, or 12853, except to the extent now authorized pursuant to the relevant Executive order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive order that I have issued.

The new Executive order is necessary to further the implementation of the Governors Island Agreement by reaching persons who are supporting the groups fomenting violence and opposing the restoration of constitutional government in Haiti. The new Executive order is to be implemented by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 18, 1993.

ANNUAL REPORT OF FEDERAL PREVAILING RATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 5347(e) of title 5 of the United States Code, I transmit herewith the 1992 annual report of the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 19, 1993.

1992 CALENDAR YEAR REPORTS BY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ON ACTIVITIES UNDER HIGHWAY SAFETY ACT AND NATIONAL TRAFFIC AND MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY ACT OF 1966—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and the Committee on Energy and Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 1992 calendar year reports as prepared by the Department of Transportation on activities under the Highway Safety Act and the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle

Safety Act of 1966, as amended (23 U.S.C. 401 note and 15 U.S.C. 1408).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 19, 1993.

IN OPPOSITION TO TAX INCREASES IN NAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity in the 5-minute section here to explain why my colleagues and I are opposed to including tax increases in the proposed North American Free-Trade Agreement.

□ 2130

First, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I am leaning strongly in favor of supporting the NAFTA, but it would be difficult to support increased taxes as part of the NAFTA agreement. Because NAFTA will reduce tariffs, it has been estimated that the Government will lose approximately \$2.3 billion over the next 5 years, and this amount will need to be made up.

While I believe that NAFTA will, in fact, spur new economic growth and, thus, actually increase taxable income and tax revenues for the Government, the House budget rules require that this loss be made up. If we must find \$2.3 billion in offsets because of the House rules, we have only one good alternative, and that is to cut spending. We can either raise taxes or cut spending.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has proposed a \$5 per person increase in the tax assessed on international airline travel and a doubling of the fees for customs service collected on railroad cars and trucks that cross the border. Now, in the past we are going to be making up for lost tariffs which were paid by people outside of this country with fees and taxes on people within this country, not a very fair exchange.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, a group of 27 House Republicans, all supporters of or leaning strongly for the support of NAFTA, wrote to the President indicating our strong opposition to including tax increases as part of the NAFTA treaty. As we said in the letter, it would be difficult for many of us to support NAFTA if it includes a tax increase. We are willing to look at any proposal to cut spending, but I will make a suggestion or two for the White House's benefit.

When Congress passed the President's tax package earlier this year, the bill included \$2.5 billion in increased programs. It expanded programs for food stamps over the next 5 years. This program; yes, this program, was expanded at a time when our Federal deficit is so deep and our debt goes up every day. We should cancel the expansion of this Federal Food Stamp Program, and that

will provide enough money to offset the lost revenues under NAFTA.

The NAFTA vote is expected to be close, and the President is counting on Republican votes. The President must know though that many Republicans are very strongly opposed to tax increases, and, if he insists on including them in NAFTA, he could very well lose many Republican votes.

Mr. Speaker, there is a difference in philosophy between many Republicans and the President on raising taxes, and he needs to have and be conscious of our opinion in this matter because our votes are crucial to this matter.

Today in Congress Daily the President is quoted as saying on this issue, "We have to work through this." That is right, Mr. President, we do have to work through it, and we have to come up with a consensus, as Mr. Kantor said, on approaching how we are going to recover the lost revenues.

Many of us in this House want to see NAFTA pass because it is good for this country. We do not believe that higher and new taxes are good for this country, and in conclusion I would say that in the same publication, Congress Daily, I see where the House Committee on Ways and Means has marked up the bill with the proposed taxes in it, not a very good sign of working through it, Mr. President, not a very good sign at all.

And then, even to make matters a little more discouraging, I see where the Speaker of the House has rejected the special spending cuts section which could have given us the cuts we need to meet the lost revenues from the reduced tariffs.

I reiterate. I call again upon the White House to cooperate with us on this side of the aisle. Eliminate the taxes. Let us find an acceptable alternative. Let us reduce spending, and we can pass the NAFTA agreement.

GAMBLING WITH OUR NATIONAL MILITARY STRATEGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of Ohio). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I spoke at this very spot about my concern that the Bottom-Up Review had not sized the Army properly. I also expressed my concern that peacekeeping commitments might so degrade the Army as to render it incapable of carrying out the national military strategy to fight two major regional conflicts almost simultaneously. In summary, I noted that it is increasingly difficult for the military, especially the Army, to accommodate new peacekeeping missions with fewer forces and reduced budgets.

Tonight, I want to discuss a problem intimately related to the first, the lack

of budgetary support for the Army. While I have concerns about the sizing of the Army, I also have similar concerns about the funding of it. Simply put, the funding of the Army is insufficient, even for the smaller 10 division force described in the Bottom-Up Review, which I disagree with. We need 12 divisions.

First, allow me to discuss a little bit of recent history. The Army came out of Vietnam a demoralized, if not broken, institution. Twenty years ago, in the waning years of that bitter conflict, the Army instituted a number of far-reaching changes. Some of those changes it was forced to accept; others it initiated. Those changes included the end of the draft and beginning of the All-Volunteer Force; the creation of the total force concept, and the establishment of the training and doctrine command [TRADOC] at Fort Monroe, VA. These decisions affected the Army profoundly.

Though many military leaders expressed great misgivings about the AVF, by the early 1980's the services had finally learned how to make it work. Recruiting high school graduates and paying them well helped create an Army of quality people.

The total force concept proved itself in the Persian Gulf war just as Army Chief of Staff Creighton Abrams had designed it back in the early 1970's. Since much of the Active Army's combat support and combat service support was found in the Guard and Reserve, the requirement to activate those forces helped bring along the support of the American public.

And the third decision, the creation of the training and doctrine command, paid great dividends. First rate training programs, as symbolized by the establishment of the national training center at Fort Irwin in the deserts of California, and the renewed emphasis on professional military education helped produce Army combat leaders who had studied war and were well prepared when called to action. Those officers responded to that call in magnificent fashion in Panama and the Persian Gulf war with campaign plans that produced quick victories and few American casualties.

The investments of the 1980's produced an American Army that was able to combine excellent people, first-rate equipment, and top notch military thinking to win decisively on the field of battle. Today, those hard-won gains secured over the past 20 years are at risk.

The balance that needs to be sustained among competing demands—procuring modern equipment, attracting quality people, maintaining adequate numbers of trained forces, and attending to infrastructure needs—has been lost. We are addressing today's needs at the expense of tomorrow's investments; today's current operations

and readiness at the expense of tomorrow's modernization. Unless that balance can be restored among the competing demands we will have an Army that will have good people, but with old equipment and not enough forces to do the job if we hope to win the next war with few casualties.

Even at the 10 Active Army division level, to which I disagree as we need 12, the programmed budget to accomplish modernization of weapons, adequate personnel and unit training, and infrastructure upkeep is not enough. Readiness of deployed forces has been maintained by underfunding investment. The backlog of major Army items needing maintenance and repair has increased dramatically. Some \$400 million of that money has been diverted to fund operations in Somalia and Southwest Asia. On the procurement front the Army budget is 60 percent less than where it was expected to be 3 years ago—\$18.7 billion versus \$6.8 billion.

Modernization provides major leverage in achieving a decisive warfighting capability—the smaller the force, the more modern it must be. The Army needs about \$15 billion per year to modernize in an adequate manner. It is falling at least \$2 billion and maybe as much as \$5 billion short in the area of research, development, and acquisition. In this week's issue of Defense News a front page article emphasizes the point by revealing that nearly half of all Army procurement programs are in danger of either being reduced or eliminated over the next 5 years.

Force reductions to date have been substantial—the inactivation of four divisions and one corps. Two other divisions are to be deactivated by the end of fiscal year 1994. And if current plans found in the Bottom-Up Review are carried out, two more Army divisions will be deactivated sometime over the next few years.

The Army is undergoing fundamental changes as it shapes itself as “a strategic force for the 21st century.” The Army is coming home. It will be primarily an America-based force rather than the forward deployed force it was during the cold war. We are making the investments in Airlift and Sealift to help give the Army a substantial projection capability. We need an Army of 12 active divisions with 555,000 active duty soldiers. The Army also needs approximately \$64 billion per year. The fiscal year 1994 budget request is \$60.7 billion.

Unless such readjustments are taken in the fiscal year 1995 Defense budget, we will be gambling in a fashion that undermines our stated national military strategy. The price will be paid, as it has always been paid in the past, by American soldiers who were not given adequate support in peacetime.

LEGISLATION NEEDED TO PROTECT LESBIANS AND GAY MEN AGAINST JOB DISCRIMINATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that I feel compelled to take this time. I have been asked from time to time by some of my colleagues why I think there is a need for legislation which would protect lesbians and gay men against job discrimination. People have said, “After all, there is no problem. People are not discriminated against in hiring in this country based on their sexual orientation. So why press for legislation? Is this some effort to get some special rights?”

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that people ought to be getting special rights based on their sexual orientation. Indeed, while I am a supporter of affirmative action in cases of minority discrimination where there has been an obvious community impact, I do not think affirmative action is an affirmative remedy for the kind of discrimination gay men and women face. What I think we need is simply legislation that says you are entitled as an individual to win a job or lose it based on your merits.

Again, I have been asked, “Well, why is there any need for this?”

Sadly, this week's Roll Call, in yesterday's edition, gives an example of the reason. Three Members of this body, three elected officials, explicitly told a newspaper in Oklahoma that they would refuse to hire people who were honest about being gay or lesbian; without regard to their qualifications, apparently, without regard to their diligence, without regard to their ideology. The fact that these individuals would be gay or lesbian and would presumably, if asked, say so, the fact that they would not hide, apparently would result in their not being hired. Now, if that happens here in the House of Representatives, it is obvious that it is happening elsewhere in society.

Mr. Speaker, my own view is that it is time for us to clarify this with regard to the House of Representatives. I daresay that many of our colleagues were surprised to hear that. That is certainly the conversations I have had. I was particularly surprised with regard to a couple of my colleagues, by the way, because I thought some of them were those who felt that the U.S. Congress should not exempt itself from laws that apply to others.

I have heard people say that the Congress must abide by the laws that everybody else abides by. Congress must stop abrogating to itself the right to evade laws.

Well, I agree with that, and I hope that the Hamilton-Boren committee,

when it comes out, will cover us fully under all the laws.

Mr. Speaker, I have to note if we were a private corporation located here, we would be covered by the District of Columbia's law that says you cannot discriminate against people based on their sexual orientation. So apparently some of my colleagues feel, despite their rhetoric about complying with the law, that it is perfectly okay for them to ignore the law of the District of Columbia that would apply if they were a private corporation, because they feel the need to discriminate, without regard to people's qualifications, against gay men and women lesbians.

I think there is a gap between the rhetoric and the actual actions. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is a matter we should address. What individual Members do may be wholly within the control of individual Members. I do think once this explicit announcement of people's right to discriminate has come forward, again without regard to qualifications, without regard to behavior, without regard to whatever discretion people show, but the simple fact would be enough to deny them the chance to work in these offices, I hope we will be able to make it clear through the leadership that such policies of bigotry do not cover those areas of the House in general. It would certainly not be worthy of our commitment to individual rights and individual dignity to so practice.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will, by this unfortunate incident, not again be asked why some of us feel the need to protect people against discrimination. It would seem to me hard for Members to deny the existence of a discrimination which three of our colleagues have now announced they feel free to practice.

APPOINT SPECIAL PROSECUTOR TO INVESTIGATE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the full 60 minutes. In fact, I will just take a few minutes tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that rumors are flying around the city of Washington right now to the fact that the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Ron Brown, may be resigning in the next few days. I do not know if they are true or not, but many have asked me today, because of the investigation that we have been working on and have launched to find out whether or not Mr. Brown did take a \$700,000 bribe and whether or not Mr. Brown was going to get ultimately millions, and maybe tens or hundreds of millions, of dollars

in royalties and so forth from the Government of Vietnam for removing the trade barriers or helping remove the trade barriers that have been in place against that government.

We believe, those of us who have been involved in this investigation, that even if Mr. Brown does resign, that the investigation should go forward, because there is a cloud that hangs over the Clinton administration because of the allegations.

Now, there is a grand jury investigation that has been taking place down in Miami, FL. That will deal with Mr. Brown and the possibility of his illegal actions.

But we have taken two steps to remove the trade barriers against Vietnam, even though we have not had an accounting, a full accounting, of the 2,200 POW-MIA's that are missing in that country and in Southeast Asia. Because of that, that we have taken these two steps to normalize relations and remove those trade barriers, a lot of people have been asking the question, did Mr. Brown have undue influence on the administration, even the President, in getting him to remove these trade barriers or start taking those steps?

Mr. Speaker, today a letter was sent to the Attorney General asking her to appoint a special independent counsel. The reason we sent this letter to the Attorney General is because she said, I believe quoted in the October 1 Washington Post, "If I appoint the person or select a person who is going to be the counsel, you are still going to question the conflict of interest as long as I am involved in that process." Again she said, "For me to appoint somebody, you will be asking, 'Well, that person has a conflict, too, because you appointed them.'"

Mr. Speaker, she said these conflicts might arise because she is a Cabinet-appointed officer, as is Mr. Brown.

In order to work with the Attorney General in overcoming this dilemma, a letter was sent today signed by the Republican leader of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the Republican whip of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the chairman of the Republican Conference, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], the chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, and myself, the chairman of the Republican Study Committee, that listed not one, not two, but eight former Attorneys General or members of the Justice Department whose credentials are impeccable. They have been prosecuting attorneys, career prosecutors, and, as I said, former Attorneys General.

Mr. Speaker, they include Mike Baylson, Griffin Bell, Alan Cohen, Jim Ferguson, Mark Hellerer, Dan Reidy, David Rothenberg, and Tony Valukas, responsible people who could be ap-

pointed to conduct this investigation and to be the independent counsel in the investigation.

Mr. Speaker, we think it is absolutely essential, regardless of whether or not Mr. Brown resigns, that we have a complete investigation in the Congress, as well as have the independent counsel appointed by the Attorney General. The reason we feel that way is because this administration will continue to have a cloud hanging over it until all the questions are answered.

I have sent numerous letters to the Justice Department, letters to the National Security Council, and letters to the President himself, as well as Mr. Brown, asking for information.

In addition to that, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the ranking Republican on the Committee on Government Operations, has sent a letter to the President asking for additional information on these allegations.

□ 2150

We believe all of those questions should be answered to the full satisfaction of the Congress of the United States, and we believe the investigation should be absolutely complete, even if Mr. Brown resigns, so that the American people will know that they can have full confidence in President Clinton and this administration and that there have been no deals cut with the Government of Vietnam in order to normalize relations.

If that is done, then I think that the President will be able to continue being effective in his job as President of the United States. However, if this is not done, I think this cloud will continue to hang over the administration and will be a cloud that will grow and will continue to hurt the administration in the months and years to come.

We sent this letter today to Janet Reno, the Attorney General, and I hope that she will respond favorably and pick somebody to be the special prosecutor or special counsel, in this case, and we can get to the bottom of it as quickly as possible so that there will be no problems at all by pointing fingers at anybody in the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the letter to which I referred.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, October 19, 1993.

HON. JANET RENO,

Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

DEAR GENERAL RENO: The situation concerning Commerce Secretary Ronald Brown cries out for the appointment of a special prosecutor.

The morass of media reports and rumors about his possible actions simply must be cleared up, not only to retain the public's faith in the Administration's enforcement of the laws but also in fairness to Mr. Brown himself. He is entitled to something better than prolonged trial by press account.

You recently explained to the press your rationale for not appointing a special prosecutor in this case in the absence of a reauthorized Independent Counsel Law: "If I appoint the person or select the person, you're still going to question the conflict [of interest] as long as I am involved in that process." Again, "For me to appoint somebody, you will be asking me, 'Well, that person has a conflict, too, because you appointed them.'" (Both quotes from *The Washington Post* October 1, 1993)

We understand your dilemma and want to help.

We have developed the enclosed list of distinguished individuals from among whom you can choose a special prosecutor to deal with the Brown case. Because the list has been compiled by persons decidedly not connected with the Administration, its independence is unimpeachable. No one can suggest any conflict of interest on your part in making the appointment from our list.

We are ready to do our part to insulate from politics the investigation of Secretary Brown. We hope to hear from you.

Bob Michel, Republican Leader; Dick Arme, Chairman, Republican Conference; Newt Gingrich, Republican Whip; Henry Hyde, Chairman, Republican Policy Committee; Dan Burton, Member of Congress.

SUGGESTED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT AS SPECIAL PROSECUTOR

Mike Baylson, former U.S. attorney.
Griffin Bell, former Attorney General.
Alan Cohen, former Justice Department career prosecutor.
Jim Ferguson, former Justice Department career prosecutor.
Mark Hellerer, former Justice Department career prosecutor.
Dan Reidy, former Justice Department career prosecutor.
David Rothenberg, former assistant U.S. attorney.
Tony Valukas, former U.S. attorney.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. I am going to do a special order this evening on Somalia, having just been there yesterday. It seems further ago than that because of the span of time. I have been tracking this whole Commerce Secretary Ron Brown thing with you very carefully.

Are you hearing rumors from some of the networks that Mr. Brown is even indicating he might resign?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I received some calls from national television networks today and some news media saying that they had had some reports that there would be some more revelations in some of the news media in the next few days and that Ron Brown's resignation was imminent. It may be for the reasons that we have raised during the investigation, or it may be for some other reason. I simply do not know. But if it is the case, as I said before, and he does resign, we should still continue this investigation to its conclusion.

Mr. DORNAN. He was one of the first, being the head of the Democratic Party during the whole entire election year and for a long time before that in being a key part of the Clinton victory; he

was one of the first appointments made, one of the first confirmed by the Senate within a week after the inauguration. He greased through the Senate. It was a virtual love fest. The Republicans were as weak as I have ever seen them. And if he were to consider resigning, it certainly would not be based on his protestations of a week ago and 2 weeks ago that he was virtually as clean as a hound's tooth.

If he were to resign, then it would be what I call the Coelho approach. Throw everything over the side and get out of town, hope that the Justice Department stops all investigations. I think that probably the least believable of all the things I have heard was that he never had any role in moves toward removing all sanctions against the Communist government of Hanoi. To have a Commerce Secretary not taking the lead in what was virtually a veiled campaign promise would be astounding to me. It just does not have the ring of truth to it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. There are many inconsistencies, as the gentleman well knows.

First of all, he said he never met Mr. Hao, who allegedly gave him the \$700,000 bribe. Then he admitted he met him not once but three times. It was said that there was never any bank account at Indosuez set up to get that money in Singapore, and then we found out, through FBI sources, that moneys were transferred electronically from the Government of Vietnam to a bank in Singapore.

It could be a coincidence, but I certainly doubt it. And then he appeared before our committee, and I asked him personally if he had any involvement in making a decision or trying to influence the decision to normalize relations with Vietnam. He answered not once but twice, "No, Congressman, I had no involvement in that and neither did I discuss it with any of my top staff persons."

Then we found out from a mole, if you will, that the NSC held a meeting in June, and one of his top lieutenants was the chief pusher, if you will, to normalize relations with Vietnam and lower those trade barriers.

It is inconceivable, as the gentleman just said, that the Secretary of the Department of Commerce would not know what one of his top deputies was doing, as far as trying to push this thing through.

Mr. DORNAN. What about the chartered jet from National Airport down to West Palm Beach? Has anybody in the media gone for their Pulitzer Prize to try and get the records at both ends to find out if that jet actually went down there, who the passengers were? What about the house he bought for someone here that closed 3 days after his, the approval of his appointment in the Senate, one of the meetings was supposedly at that house that he had purchased for a nonrelated friend?

The whole thing, it brings to mind the double standard of the media in this city and in the biggest cities of this country. If this were a Republican, that is not Mr. Sununu, our friend, going to a stamp show of philatelists. This is something they would absolutely be like sharks in the water. It would be Watergate all over again. Where are you, Woodward and Bernstein, when we need you?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just say that I share the same, almost the same degree of cynicism toward the media that my colleague from California does. However, in this case I will tell you that a number of the networks and a number of the media people have been working on it. They may not have been working as hard as they have on other cases. I simply do not know. But I do know that they have been looking into it.

I think they believe that Mr. Brown misled them in the past. I think they are very concerned about that, and I think that they have been working on it.

As far as how thorough they have been working on it, I do not know. I can tell you this: The questions you just raised about the jet, about telephone logs, about Federal Express letters that went back and forth from Florida to the Commerce Department and Mr. Brown, we have asked for all of those records, as many as we can possibly get.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] the ranking Republican on the Government Operations Committee, has written to the White House asking for phone logs and a lot of other information. I believe if we get that information, we will get to the bottom of it.

If the White House or the executive branch tries to stonewall us, then we will have a big problem. But I am hopeful that the President and his people who are advising him down there will see fit to give us the information so this cloud that I talked about that hovers over the administration will be removed and they can do their job.

Mr. DORNAN. I am looking forward to tracking this one. We have heard so many attack 1-minutes against the Bush administration over the last 4 years on absolutely no evidence in most cases. The silence is thundering here on this and several other things that have already happened in the first 9 months of the Clinton administration.

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order for this evening reserved by the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] to speak on the Free-Trade Agreement, that I be allowed to take that order at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

ON NAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. COPPERSMITH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, I should not take nearly that much time. I want to take some time this evening, however, to talk a little bit about the Free-Trade Agreement but talk specifically about a small business I know in Arizona that is in Metropolitan Phoenix.

It is in a town called, a city called Glendale, AZ. It is called La Corona Foods.

I think this is an excellent example of what kind of businesses are succeeding now, what kind of businesses will succeed with the passage of the Free-Trade Agreement.

La Corona Foods, Inc., is a small business in Arizona that is owned by a man named Charles Pritchard. Three years ago Mr. Pritchard began selling his yogurt in Mexico, and over that 3 years his firm has grown to the point where now 45 percent of his sales and one-third of his staff is tied to exports to Mexico.

It turns out that in Mexico consumption of yogurt is 3½ times higher than it is in the United States. Part of that has to do with the fact that the Mexican population is somewhat younger, a better market for yogurt. Part of it has to do with yogurt is an excellent source of protein, and there is a great consumer demand for it in Mexico.

But this once small business with \$15 million in annual sales, 85 employees, is now the No. 1 best selling American-made yogurt in Mexico. This is a business that is selling to Mexico right now, and it is selling and is succeeding in the international market, despite, really, an effective tariff of about a little more than 20 percent.

There is a tariff that Mexico places, plus as well as the fact that milk prices in the United States are relatively higher because of our support price system. La Corona is succeeding, despite the fact that in this case the Mexican tariff is significantly higher than the average tariff Mexico imposes on all goods.

□ 2200

We have recited time and again the fact that the average Mexican tariff is about two and one-half times the average American tariff. For most goods, across the board, it averages about 10 percent compared to the average American tariff at about 2.5 to 4 percent, so Mexico imposes a tariff in the aggregate of 2.5 percent, but that is higher in particular industries and it is higher for particular goods.

For example, in computers and semiconductors, that is something that is also important in Arizona, the effective tariff on semiconductors is 10 percent in Mexico. It is essentially 2 percent or less coming from Mexico and the United States, and the tariff on the products that semiconductors are used in, because most people do not just buy raw semiconductors, they buy computers, they buy telephone equipment, communication equipment, and that tariff can be 20 percent.

Here we have a situation where the Mexican tariff essentially makes La Corona 20 to 25 percent more expensive than the Mexican product, but they have succeeded, so now, nearly over \$5 million to \$6 million of their sales are sales to Mexico, and over one-third of their growth, one-third of the staff they have added, are now in the export business. They are at risk should NAFTA fail.

We have asked the question time and again: Who wins and who loses if NAFTA succeeds or if NAFTA fails. Here is a small business that fails, that hurts, that will suffer should NAFTA not succeed. They are succeeding right now, but they know that should the United States turn its back on the rapidly growing Mexican market, their sales to Mexico would plummet; that one way or another, the Mexican Government will find a way to block American goods, to find a preferential way to import products from other countries. That is really part of the message about NAFTA.

NAFTA requires so much more of the Mexican Government than it does of the United States. It requires Mexico to lower its tariffs much more.

As the gentleman from Florida, SAM GIBBONS, has said, and has been quoted on this floor a number of times, we essentially have one-way free trade. We allow goods from Mexico to come into the United States at relatively negligible tariffs. We have lowered our tariff, and we are importing a great deal from Mexico. Mexico still has relatively high tariffs, but because of the quality and because of the excellence of American goods, we are still able to export considerable amounts to Mexico. We went from running a trade deficit with Mexico in 1987 to today, where we run a large trade surplus, some \$40.6 billion worth of products each year.

La Corona is important because it is a small business. Small business represents about 93 percent of the nearly 90,000 firms in Arizona. Those are the firms that really are most likely to benefit from these increases in opportunity, most likely to benefit from NAFTA giving American companies preferential access to the rapidly growing Mexican market.

What many people do not realize about NAFTA is, while Mexico will lower its tariffs with respect to the United States, it will retain those tar-

iffs with respect to the rest of the world, so we will have a situation where it will be Japanese chip makers and Japanese computer firms and Japanese electronics firms who face that relatively high Mexican tariff of 10 percent on semiconductors or 20 percent on the finished products.

American firms will have a zero tariff, and there will be no incentive to locate in Mexico, to serve the Mexican market, because we will be able to gain tariff-free access to that market, as well as service the United States. Lower tariffs have caused trade to flourish. They have been a win-win situation in the past. They will cause small businesses to flourish under NAFTA.

Mr. Speaker, I speak of La Corona because it is an excellent example of a small business that sells a consumer good. No one can argue that yogurt is going to a maquiladora plant where it is being assembled with granola bits and then transhipped back into the United States. This is a consumer good that is made in the United States, and it is made in the United States because that is where the quality work force is, that is more productive. It is made in the United States because we have a far better supply of quality milk. It is sold to consumers in Mexico, and it is sold by the millions of dollars for this small firm.

They have no incentive to relocate, should the free-trade agreement go into place, because right now they could make that choice if they wished, but they would be moving further away from the source of their quality raw material, American milk. They would also be moving away from their skilled U.S. work force. They have economic reasons to stay. What NAFTA offers La Corona is the opportunity to expand its sales in the Mexican market.

Mr. Speaker, finally, let me just quote from Mr. Pritchard. He criticized the famous quote, I think, that many people have said about Ross Perot, "If NAFTA is passed, you will hear a giant sucking sound."

Mr. Pritchard says that is entirely wrong. What is going to be the big sucking sound is the goods and services we will sell down there, not jobs. He is productive. He is a small business that is succeeding, that benefits workers in my State from access to the American market, access that NAFTA will improve.

We need to end this system of one-way free trade and get two-way free trade. I know if we just provide a level playing field of equal tariffs going both ways, the American work force, American business, can compete. They are second to none. Their products are valued all over the world.

Let us try and lock up that access to the rapidly-growing Mexican market and approve NAFTA.

THE STATUS OF AMERICAN TROOPS IN SOMALIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, when I took a special order in this distinguished Chamber last Friday, I made comment that I was receiving some resistance in trying to go at no taxpayer expense, only at the expense of my own energy, to hitchhike on U.S. Air Force C-141's or the giant Galaxy, Lockheed Galaxy C-5, to Somalia to observe, myself, using my own military experience and my own world travel that has taken me, mostly at my own expense, overwhelmingly at my own expense, to more nations around the world than any Congressman or Senator who has ever drawn God's breath in 217 years, and I was not able to go last week.

I wanted to go on one of the flights from Hunter Air Base in Georgia, with one of the M-1 tanks that should have gone over there weeks before, and then, as I said Friday on the floor here, that I would fly commercial if I had to, and I started to make the reservations on United Airlines to Amsterdam, Amsterdam on KLM to Nairobi and the nation of Kenya to the south of Somalia, where I would have muscled my way onto a press pool airplane that the U.S. military is providing to try and get people up to Somalia to tell the story. As of right now, there are no American journalists or photojournalists in there that I know of.

When the Pentagon saw that I was determined to get over there, I must say they did assist me, gave me an escort officer, and the two of us hitchhiked by air starting at 5:30 Sunday morning, two days ago, to what is called Cairo West Airport, a Soviet-built field to the west, obviously, of the city of Cairo. It was over a 13-hour flight, two mid-air refuelings.

We then had a layover, where I took advantage of discussing with all of the troops coming and going from Mogadishu and Somalia through West Cairo, which is about the only spot that we are transiting troops up to Europe or straight home to the United States with some stops, sometimes air refueling, no stops. I was able to get a good opinion of what the young men and women, many women, about 14 percent of our forces there, feel coming out or going back for a second or third tour, how they feel about the dangers, about feeding starving people.

Then I picked up a flight just over 5 hours, the same C-5 that we had been with since Fort Benning, and got into Mogadishu International Airport, which is an armed camp. It is the headquarters of the 75th Ranger Regiment, 3d Battalion, out of Fort Benning. I was met on the ramp with my escorts by Maj. Gen. Thomas Montgomery. He had the blades spinning on an H-60 hel-

icopter, and I put on a flak jacket, a helmet, jumped in, and we began to take a tour of Mogadishu.

Before I tell the 1,200,000 interested American, including the mothers, fathers, wives, and older children of many of our force over there, that is going to go back up to 10,000 before it starts to come down again, what were my written objectives that I sent to the Pentagon. Then I will come back to that helicopter ride around all of Somalia and tell the Members what I think I accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, I personally wanted to view that air bridge by the Air Force to resupply our fine, the finest, military men and women in the world. I want to study the crew stress on these long flights and the need for C-17 aircraft.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORNAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from California.

□ 2210

Mr. HUNTER. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding, because I think it is important for everybody who is listening to this to understand what my friend, the gentleman from California, [Mr. DORNAN], has done. Over the weekend while a lot of us were staying in Washington, a few of us were going back to our districts, the gentleman from California, [Mr. DORNAN], because of his concern for our Armed Forces personnel, spent about 40 hours in the air flying to Somalia and back. And I want to say to you as a member of the Armed Services Committee, who depends on you, as a lot of us do for the great expertise that you provide, that we thank you for the service that you have provided, and the background that you have established, and the facts that you have brought back to us regarding the Somali situation. And I look forward to listening to the gentleman.

Mr. DORNAN. DUNCAN, I do not want to get melodramatic here. I do not even want to get dramatic, but I know I speak for you when I say it is an honor to hang out with these people. I just love being around them. I did in Vietnam, because I could not get activated as an Air Force fighter jock, so I went over there eight times, twice literally with the very salt of this Earth, and I mean that in the Biblical sense, the wives of our missing pilots, and their mothers, into Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam. And they are identical. You cannot separate them from Vietnam, your war, from Korea, or from Desert Storm, or Panama, or Grenada, where these fine people, augmented by 14 percent females in this dangerous area of the world. They are just great to be around, from the highest general to the youngest shave-tail private first class.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will yield for one last brief statement, I

just want to say to my friend that just a few minutes ago I talked on the phone in the Cloakroom with my old platoon sergeant from the 75th Rangers, Charlie Company Rangers from 1970-71 in Vietnam. I was fortunate enough when the 173d Airborne Brigade came home to go and serve with the 75th Rangers until they stood down in II Corps, and I did not do anything special in Vietnam. But I served with a lot of great people, and Pop Carter, my platoon sergeant was one of those people. And Pop was an individual who spent 54 months in Vietnam with various units, with the 173d Airborne initially. He was in the Daktho operation, and was one of the last people ultimately out of Vietnam when we left in such a disarray in the last phase of the war.

I asked him, and he was up to speed totally on what was happening in Somalia, as always. He is in Valdosta, GA, but he is watching television, and he is reading, and he knew what was happening.

Mr. DORNAN. I met him in the House restaurant a few years ago.

Mr. HUNTER. You met Doc with his son who is in the U.S. Marines at Fort Lejeune. I asked Pop what he thought about the way the Secretary of Defense handled this. And he said very simply, he said, "He broke the contract he had with us. That was a contract to provide us the very best."

I thought that that was interesting coming from an individual who spent a lot of time, and I asked him if he thought it was reminiscent of Vietnam. And he said, "absolutely, where the politicians in Washington are overruling the ground commanders in the field," and that is what happened when the Secretary of Defense, Les Aspin, refused to send the armor that the field commander asked for.

So I just let Pop know that we are going to be talking a little bit about the Rangers tonight, and those that fell in battle. And once again, I appreciate the gentleman undertaking this very arduous task for the benefit of all of the Members of the House and for the benefit of the families of those who fell.

Mr. DORNAN. I appreciate it, DUNCAN. And I got as far as getting on a helicopter with General Montgomery.

But let me tell you, the trip started at Andrews, and I missed seeing Michael Durant by three or four minutes. He arrived from Germany, from Landstuhl Army Hospital right outside the great Ramstein Air Force Base, and his wife had joined him over there, and she was on the flight coming back. And they transferred him to a Nightengale C-9 hospital plane. Warren Christopher was there. One of the best Chiefs of Staff of the Army we have ever had, Gordon Sullivan, was there to pin the Purple Heart on him.

By the time I got down to Bunning and turned on the evening news, CWO

Michael Durant had arrived in Fort Campbell, and it was a lump in the throat, a tear jerker. The whole base turned out, all of those 160 aviation, special ops aviation regiment troops were there with their Red Berets. He was there on a stretcher with his brand new Purple Heart. They said you are back with your own, we are going to take care of you, we are going to get you back on the job, and we are going to get you back in the cockpit. And Durant raised his fist in victory. And all the wives were there with signs of "Welcome home, hero." And I choked watching it, because within a day I would be talking to young Sgt. Mason Hall who was the gunner on the chopper that went down with the two men that I mentioned last week in the special order with you that I wanted to see get the Medal of Honor. I can correct some things that had been given to the press, not been given to them incorrectly, but wrong assumptions had been made.

M. Sgt. Gary Gordon of Maine did not have to rappel down to the crash site of Durant's helicopter, the second that was destroyed of three within an hour that day on October 3. This chopper went right down on the deck, four feet off the ground, and Gordon, and Randall Shughart jumped out and ran to Durant's helicopter.

This may be as close as we will ever get to a narrative or of an action battle report of what happened, because young Mason Hall told me he saw them reach the two pilots. One of them, Gary or Randy, pulled Durant out of the helicopter. The other one was pulling out a man that I surmised on this floor last week would probably have a Vietnam record. It was Ray Frank, chief warrant officer. He was 45. When I saw his age I deducted 20 years back to our pullout in 1973, and he would have been 25. And I said this may have been one of our teenaged, 19-year-old warrant officer pilots earlier, and I bet he has had a tour in Vietnam. DUNCAN, he had three tours in Vietnam, 31 combat missions. And when I come back to the floor again I will find out whether they were in Huey Hog Gunships, or Huey Slicks transporting troops around, or Cobras that were introduced in 1968, the two men, thin-bodied Cobras.

One of these Rangers pulled out Ray Frank, and I am hanging on every word. We are standing right there where one of the mortars hit and killed another soldier in front of the Ranger barracks, the outdoor living, and I will mention that more in a minute. And he said, Congressman, at that moment an RPG hit my helicopter No. 3 that Shughart and Gordon had just gone out to help the two pilots from helicopter II that was down, and helicopter I by that time had about 90 Rangers around it. The RPG hit right behind me, he said, on the door. He had traded places with the left gunner whose hand was

crippled from fire, and he said when the RPG hit right next to me, it ripped through the helicopter and tore off the leg of another Ranger that was firing with a rifle from the helicopter. So they were on fire. They got the collective up, started to smoke all the way back to Newport where they crashed. They did get the trooper in the back with the leg missing to an ambulance. He is in a hospital here in the States. The one with his hand hurt is OK. It was a hard landing. That helicopter was destroyed. I did not know that on the floor here either. So that is three \$13 million helicopters in an hour.

But what everybody wanted to get across, including their commanding general, Bill Garrison, was that that was a successful mission. They captured 20 of Aided's lieutenants. Four were killed in the crossfire, mainly by their own fire at our Rangers, and the Rangers got in with armored Humvees and got out, got out with all of their prisoners arrested in the name of the United Nations resolution that Madeleine Albright put through in New York City at the United Nations because this man was killing U.N. troops left and right brutally in the daytime, in ambush, executing people like the 24 Pakistanis at food distribution points. This guy has gone absolutely wild as a killer.

And what is absolutely stunning to me, the more I research this, is that he is a former chief of police of Mogadishu. He was the chief of staff of the army under Barre. He was put in jail by Barre after bringing him to power in October 1969 for 6 years and was notorious in Somalia. This scorpion is tough. Then Barre let him out, and gives him a colonelcy, and he goes up in the Ogaden to battle 11,000 Cuban troops. And they got their clock cleaned because the Russians weighed in with commanding officers in some of the units, 11,000 battle-hardened Cubans, some of them from Angola, superior weaponry, and kicked them good, sent them back to Somalia, and eventually he chased Barre, the dictator, out into Kenya and took over.

□ 2220

The mass of killing and destruction in the streets that we witnessed on American television all these years, they brought about this horrible famine where some 350,000 people died. He did not seem to worry about that. His wife is living off the dole in Canada. One of his rejected wives, that is. He may have three. He has not only a son in this country who is, as far as I know, a fine young Marine in the service, he has three other sons going through our college system. He is a very smart man of letters, he considers himself. So I asked Admiral Howe there, our charge, McInerney, I asked what is it that started him killing? And they said, they all said, quite simply, he wants to

be dictator of the country. He thinks he has earned it.

When he saw the way the United Nations was going, the direction in which it was going, the nation building, possible multiparty system, elections, he did not like it.

When the Pakistanis took the radio station away from him where he was putting out his propaganda, he started killing. He has killed seven Nigerians and wounded a dozen more, and I mean arms and legs off. He has murdered a dozen Moroccans and killed their battalion commander, who at first—a fellow from north of Morocco who would not fire on women and children—Aided's people were setting them up as shields, and it cost him his life. What also cost him his life was staying on the radio, his heroism, helping the Moroccans fight back. He rejected medical aid.

He has killed four or five Malaysians, he has killed more, three more Pakistanis in addition to the 24 killed in that raid. He has killed four American MP's with an auto-detonated landmine. I flew over that in a H-60—it sounds funny when I say this, given the 7-hour time difference—yesterday I am looking down at the wreckage of an American MT humvee that was blown apart, killing four kids, young men, heroes, on August 8. It sits there in the street. We cannot get to it to clean it up. That is a kind of "in your face."

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman would yield, would the gentleman describe Mogidishu as compared to an American city?

Mr. DORNAN. Well, this is about the best thing I got out of the trip because if you travel as much as I have been fortunate to travel as a journalist, in my life, you have a great frame of reference to ask yourself, "Compared to what," the lay of the land. I do not have to do all this sequentially because I wanted to mention circling your old 75th Ranger Group at Fort Benning, all encased in a big cyclone high-wire fence with razor wire on the top. I can imagine the great 75th guys at Fort Benning when somebody says, "What do you do," he says, inside the post, "Excuse me. I am not allowed to talk about this. I am going to go into my regimental headquarters," and he punches his secret code and disappears behind this high fence. So they are a super-trained force. The gentleman has been to Benning, there is a parachute school, infantry school. The deputy commander, Colonel Camp, pointed out that the fire we saw coming in was not antiaircraft fire to stop this congressman, it was the 75th anniversary of the Benning facility. They had the Old Guard from Fort Myer down there, and the fireworks were on as we were coming into the pattern. But I drove around the 75th, and I asked them how many Rangers were wounded in the wee hours on the 24th. I asked are they

all back here; they said "yes." I said, "How are they doing in the hospitals? Are they going to get back to duty, some of them?" They said, "Congressman, one man is in the hospital, Michael Collins, with a bullet through his knee, and he is going to need some therapy, and the other 29 all are at home with their wives and families, recuperating, getting ready to go back on the job."

By the way, for the million people listening in, Mr. Speaker, the Rangers are being pulled out, being pulled out today. Clinton had a press conference this morning. They are going to be replaced with 18-year-old, 19-year-old Marines with whitewall hair, coming off of those ships. These kids are great, but they do not know the lay of the land. These are not 34-year-old sergeants like Gary Gordon, 32 years old, like Randy Shugart, who know. Besides, why are we announcing that we are pulling them out? If Les Aspin and Clinton want to pull them out, do it quietly. Whatever happened to the dictum that you never talk about troop movements? Why should we reward Aided in a deal unless the deal was cut to get this hero pilot, Michael Durant, the Blackhawk pilot out? Why are we telling them we are taking out the one force that Aided most feared, the United States Rangers and our Fort Bragg Special Forces guys who are trained up to and beyond the standard of the 3d Battalion of the 75th Rangers?

When I came back a day later, I was met at the airport—I do not think I will use her name, because I do not want to hold her up for any kidding at Dover Air Force Base because she is a new lieutenant—but one of my appointments to the Air Force Academy, fine young lady, Air Force officer, met me at the airplane with the deputy commander at Dover. I said, "Would you take me to the morgue?" I said, "I know it is empty now with the last body has gone out into the country to be buried, William David Cleveland, Jr., 34, five children, whose mother identified him on television on the night of October 4, his dead body being dragged through the streets, beat on with—"

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will yield, that is an important point to me and, I think, a lot of other people, the fact that Colonel Aided has committed atrocities. He has committed war crimes by desecrating the bodies of these dead men and by, in some cases, mutilating the bodies.

Mr. DORNAN. They were all burned in the end, beyond recognition.

Mr. HUNTER. All done by people under his order and for a specific purpose, getting this footage for Mr. Aided.

For us to pull out and to not punish Aided is only going to lead, I think, in the future to every tinhorn dictator or terrorist in the world feeling that they

can do the same thing to the United States.

Mr. DORNAN. I have words here from Zbigniew Brzezinski, National Security Adviser to President Carter. I will read his words here in a minute. That is exactly what he is saying: "Our credibility is being disastrously eroded." But before I started my trek home last night to get back here at 4:00, this young lieutenant, class of '92 out of the Air Force Academy, the deputy commander at the base drove me around that morgue. I just wanted to see it, building 121 at Dover, a temporary building, a huge extension, one of these air-filled, heavy-cloth buildings that they thought would be needed for Desert Storm, and thank God it was not because there were only 146, of which we got back every set of remains which passed through this almost sacred building. I said I just wanted to see where—his mom called him "David," when I was with the Rangers on the ramp yesterday, they told me they called him "Bill"—I just wanted to see where the charred, desecrated remains of Sergeant Cleveland ended up. His first stop coming home, and his last stop as he was sent to his family for a decent burial, a hero's burial.

So, back to Benning—I do want to say something about all these C-5 crews—four landings, every one of them, hardly knew when we touched the ground. The gears touched so softly we just settled down. Here we are 35 feet in the air looking at a humvee following, and I go, "What is that? A little Jeep from World War II?" The whole perspective is changed when you're so high in the air.

But on that second leg, let me advance forward from Benning to all the Rush Limbaugh fans at Cairo-West Airport, unbelievable, all the young men and women I talked to on the way to Somalia, a little nervous about the conditions there, obviously all are going to be away from their families for Christmas and Thanksgiving, of course, and come back to this 5-hour flight through the rest of the night and in the morning I am approaching Somalia.

First thing, I look out the window, and I am looking at the U.S.S. Guadalcanal. We just went through the 50th anniversary of the battle, the longest in American history, that that ship is named after. I looked down there, and one of the C-5 pilots said, "Boy, this is boring." There are already two C-5's at Mogadishu, and it cannot hold three. So we have to hover there over the water and orbit out there at 1,500 feet. I looked out here, and there is one of these big deployment ships with the ramps out, sticking out front, here is a hovercraft zipping around. I said to the pilot, "You think it is boring up here in a holding pattern? What do you think of those Marines down there, stacked seven to eight in the berths?

They are going to back up this coastline for 5½ more months." I looked at him, and he said, "You are right. I will never say that again."

I looked down at the Guadalcanal, that shipload of Marines, hundreds of Marines, 3,600 of them who are going to be off the coast, and I said, "I hope we don't lose one of those kids down there the way we have lost these 10-year-old, 12-year-old, and 35-year-old Ray Frank with three combat full tours of Vietnam, 31 combat months."

Finally, we get cleared in, we land. The first thing that struck me, to come back to your question finally, was how small Mogadishu is. As you are approaching the airfield from the southwest going northeast, you look out and here is desert surrounding the city. This is the way Palm Springs, California, used to be. Here is the last tree, and that is all desert.

□ 2230

It is all desert beyond the October 21 road, and I have been getting briefed up in the Intel Committee that they had streets going out that looked like it was four times bigger than it is as a city. I should have listened to my daughter who was there in 1982 describing it to me.

We come across the Indian encampment—India. I did not know this. They had a dozen, maybe 10 Soviet-built T-72 main battle tanks, one of the best in the world.

I found out later they were there the night of October 3 and 4 when our guys were being picked off by snipers one by one, and 18 died. They were there.

General Montgomery told me they had to call Delhi in the dead of night. The Italians had to call Rome.

This chain of command with the United Nations and our guys is not going to work.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this is an important point for the American people. The point is that it is true when President Clinton says the American Quick Reaction Force is under American command. That is true, but the backup force that may have to rescue him may be, and in this case it was the Malaysians who had the armor, because no Americans had armor, because Secretary Aspin did not want to antagonize the world audience, or whatever his political reasons for not sending that.

So the point is that you have got these other countries that are not under American command, and if they choose not to participate, you can call in and say, "I've got an American company pinned down under heavy fire," and they have to go pick up the phone and call up their home country and their government and say, "Should we risk it going in to help the Americans?"

If they do not get the OK, they are under no obligation to move and to rescue our people, so it is purely a voluntary operation. It may occur. You may be rescued. You may not be rescued when you work in a U.N. mission and you are having to depend on another country.

So is it true, and this question has been going around Capitol Hill, is it true that these countries have to call home to get permission to help the Americans?

Mr. DORNAN. That is true, but one thing I did want to straighten out, it is the advantage of a little "I was there."

I asked General Montgomery, I asked one of his top lieutenant colonels, William David of the 10th Mountain Light Division, I said, "Is there any truth to this rumor that some Americans, and you were on the scene, Colonel David, to take out a sidearm and threaten some Malaysian?"

And General Montgomery exploded and used a good barnyard expletive, "Absolutely not true," he said.

The problem was language barriers, coordination, getting permission. They were willing to fight their way in and die for us in a rescue operation, which two Malaysians and many Pakistanis were wounded.

The Pakistani commander personally came up to me, snapped to attention in the U.N. headquarters—no, Montgomery's headquarters—saluted me.

"What an honor to help you, sir. What an honor to serve with you."

So it is not a problem of personal bravery. A lot of U.N. troops there have fought well against Aided, but it is this uncomfortable feeling when I was questioning these people about this lack of smooth coordination, and tomorrow I am maybe going to do a special order on chapters 6 and 7 of the U.N. Code under which this chain of command is supposed to take place, people whose names I will not mention, pretty much as high as you can get around there, whispered to me, "Congressman, it doesn't work."

Now, all the former flower children in the Clinton administration, if they think of any violence at all, they just shudder. They want it all to be under the United Nations because—I know this is a rough statement I am about to make, but I believe it—Bill Schlesinger once said about Governor Michael Dukakis that he felt he had a visceral—nice good strong word—a visceral dislike for the United States military, even though he had sat in the barracks in Korea right after the war ended, he got over there, but he never went out, never associated, and got out as fast as he could, a 2-year draftee; but he said, Dukakis, a bright man, showed this distaste, never visited one of the military installations, not even the head electronic base for the whole U.S. Air Force right outside of Boston, the Lincoln Laboratory there, never

visited any facility or went near anybody in uniform the whole 8 years he was Governor of Massachusetts.

Well, that sentence comes back to me all the time with the Clinton folks, a visceral dislike for all things military.

That is what caused the insult to Barry McCaffrey, our 3-star hero who is the division commander of the Point of the Spear, the Stewart Army Post 24th Infantry Division in Desert Storm, a woman insulted him in the White House. She said, "We don't talk to people in uniform. Don't wear it here."

There is this whole undercurrent there, and I will tell you, it is affecting the morale of the military, not their performance. They are overlooking all this. The officers say nothing if somebody is listing from the White House.

Some of the NCO's and all of the enlisted men who feel they have not given up their first amendment rights, they have lots of observations and a lot of them are politically astute, and as I said, a third or more of them listen to Rush Limbaugh when they are home all throughout the United States. So some of them are politically charged up.

But to come back to this helicopter flight with General Montgomery—no, let me finish answering the gentleman's question about Mogadishu.

Mr. HUNTER. How big is the city?

Mr. DORNAN. I cannot believe there are 700,000 people there. I had in my mind's eye larger than it is.

When we popped up in the helicopter, I could see the October 21 road, that is named after the October 21, 1969 revolution, when Aided as a Chief of Staff of the Army helped Ciad Beret overthrow the prior government. From that road I could see nothing but desert. I could see from the Indian encampment on the south, I could see the base named after the gentleman from California, Hunter Base, Sword Base, the university complex, the United Nations compound. I could see on the top of the hill the only place we would not fly was this swollen large hump of land covered with the better buildings, and at the very top of it three white buildings, one of them the Olympic Hotel that the Rangers hit in bright daylight about 3 o'clock in the afternoon on Sunday, October 3, and that is what I wanted to comment on.

Maybe it is because we are used to living around cities where there is so much traffic that even though we conquered most of the smog, particularly in Los Angeles, I think only 2 alert days last year, we are used to the results of light industry and lots of transportation and mobility.

We do not know what crisp air is until we get up in the mountains or go to Idaho or Wyoming or up where we sometimes go up in the Shenandoah and you say, "Look at those stars, feel this clear air," the first thing that hit me because they destroyed even the

light industry, the crisp air, visibility as far as your eye is capable of seeing, and there is the whole city laid out in front of me.

Newport is tiny, one pier. Oldport is tinier, with a big rusting freighter half sinking in the water right off the coast.

I am looking down at the water and one of the crew reminds me, because I have told them about the shark dead. He said, "Lot of sharks down there. We have had two shark deaths."

General Montgomery told me his orders are that no one goes in that water, and the beaches are gorgeous. It looks like our coast from Laguna down to the district of the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], really beautiful.

So we land at this airport. Of course, it is all torn apart from years of neglect. The Rangers are off here to the side. It has been in the print that that is where the 75th, Third Battalion is at.

I get in the helicopter. We pop up. I fly over those T-72 tanks.

We curve around the south bend and we start up past Hunter Base, which I know Aided recently was considering making a major assault on. He did not care about casualties. It is like Ho Chi Minh. He calls and whistles out to his clan in the desert, nomadic clan, "Send me some more young men to be used as cannon fodder."

We fly up the October 21 Highway and there is the famous cigarette factory where there has been much fighting.

Then a little further there is the huge pasta factory. I guess that is leftover from years of Italian colonial rule. Big tall rocket holes into the side of the building where there have been fire fights, all along the October 21 road, which I could not see on satellite imagery in past briefings, roadblocks everywhere, rusted beat up broken old vehicles, tires, rocks, bricks, everything, furniture, all along this road which they claim they are going to try to clear.

I look down and here are 200 camels. I said, "What is that?"

He said, "It's a camel bazaar."

I said, "What, selling camels?"

And he said, "Yes, for meat."

He said, "It's kind of like a used car lot."

Here are people living in hovels with green tarpaulin covers over them. Then it must go back hundreds of years like the old Siouk area, hundreds of tiny little fortress houses all jammed together, and all of a sudden here is a residential area with gutted buildings where architects from Europe must have tried to win a war.

□ 2240

They are so stylized: triangles, trapezoids, isosceles triangles, all these strange buildings. We go around by the old port area. I wanted to see where the

helicopter had crashed, the third Special Forces H-60, and I looked out, and here is a Catholic church totally gutted. I mean a cathedral, a twin spire, massive cathedral with the roof gone like it was Coventry in bombed-out England. I looked down at a mosque. It is not much better, but it has been put back in shape, and then a guy says, "Follow me, Congressman. See that block down there? Come to this intersection, see these four big trucks? That's the wreckage of our Humvee where four American MP's were killed on August 8 still there in the street."

Then we circled around back. I said, "I want to see where the helicopter crashed on September 25 and we got no remains back from on two of the three killed." The wreckage is still there laying on the street, and they showed me the scrape marks where it hit this large building, clipped this mosque, went into the street, and that was about 2:30 in the morning that a fire-fight started there.

Later in the day I heard that we have a 10th Mountain soldier trying to rescue the two warrant officers, and we did rescue them, who took a bullet in his neck. He is a paraplegic.

Then they said, "Another one of my young troops in the 10th Mountain Division lost an arm and a leg." Gordon Sullivan had told me this before I left, the four-star Chief of Staff of the Army. He said, "We had a lot of men injured in that." I have not even begun to track where they are, how they are doing from the long firefight through the night and into the morning of September 25.

But I have to correct something I said earlier, and I think I steered "DUKE" wrong. The lieutenant colonel that coordinated the whole firefight, he said, "Congressman, my men went into that burning helicopter and looked for the remains of those three men. We got the remains of one soldier. They have had a funeral for him, Fernan, F-e-r-n-a-n Richardson." He said, "But we cannot find any remains of the other two, and the helicopter was burning so badly that magnesium was running down the street. However at some point during the night the crowds went in, and they must have been in a grisly, ghoulis fashion, got what was left of those soldiers from that crash," and that is what the media reported there, not U.S. media, but on-the-scene media. They were holding up in a grisly manner parts of the bodies of our two young heroes, a door gunner and a door gunner from another regiment, one from Fort Campbell and one from Fort Drum, NY.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I think one thing, BOB that you mentioned to me before you started this special order was that we might mention again and go over the names of the people who were killed in action, and one thing

that I wanted to say was that I saw one of the fathers on a television show talking about his son and taking on, and I think with good cause, Secretary Aspin's refusal to send armor, and at one point he was asked, "Do you think your son died in vain," and he said, "Yes, I do," and he was angry, and he was upset, and, as my colleague knows, I have thought about that a lot because I participated in a small way in Vietnam, as the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] did in a very heroic way, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] did by going over to Vietnam several times, and of course in Korea we did not have a clear victory. The Korean soldiers still consider themselves the forgotten soldiers of the last 40 or 50 years—

Mr. DORNAN. It was a victory for South Korea, but not for North Korea. They are still slaves, and the South is doing very well.

Mr. HUNTER. That is right, but often people talk about those wars as being wars in which people died in vain, and I do not think that. I think that, especially in light of the end of the cold war, that if one goes down to the what we call the Retired Soldiers' and Sailors' Home, and some people call it the Old Soldiers' Home, but it is the Soldiers' and Sailors' Retirement Home down Capitol Hill—

Mr. DORNAN. Where Lincoln visited himself.

Mr. HUNTER. Yes; it was where, in fact, Lincoln wrote the Gettysburg Address. It is about 5 miles from the Capitol you will see these veterans at that home, some of them out taking exercise, taking that morning walk or down at their golf course that they have there. One gentleman who worked on the golf course had an artificial leg from wounds in Vietnam, and another one had been in Korea, Vietnam, and in World War II, and, if you talked to those people, and you listened to them, and you realized that they were engaged in these small struggles around the world that cumulatively, while what we did was in many cases bad policy, and we did it the wrong way, and we marched forward in a clumsy fashion in many cases, cumulatively those were the boys that won the cold war—

Mr. DORNAN. Oh, yes.

Mr. HUNTER. Those people at the Soldiers' and Sailors' Home or Soldiers' and Airmen's Home; excuse me, and of course the Sailors' is the same way, and I like to think of these young men who died in Somalia as contributing in some way. Everybody cannot be on the flag in the monument at Iwo Jima that we have out here next to the, adjacent to the, Arlington Cemetery where the Marines, including Ira Hayes, are raising that American flag at Mount Suribachi, but all of them contributed nonetheless, and these young men contributed too by project-

ing American power even though we have a very vague foreign policy right now and even though the gentleman and I take issue with the leadership that we have in the White House right now, and in the Pentagon. Nonetheless these young men contributed, and their contribution to freedom and to America is every bit as real as the heroes who come home from wars in which we have definitely achieved victory, like Desert Storm and like World War II, and come home to the ticker-tape parades, and I thought we might go over the names of these young men and read them off.

Mr. DORNAN. Tell you what to do.

Mr. HUNTER. And in some cases, as the gentleman mentioned, they are not all young men. Some are middle-aged men.

Mr. DORNAN. When the gentleman mentions the fathers, just hold that for a minute while I read a letter that was addressed to Congressman MARTIN HOKE in Ohio, and he sent it to all of us as what we call a "Dear Colleague" letter. It went to 433 others besides the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] and me and the five Delegates from our territories.

Just listen to this. I let all the crews read it on each one of the big C-5 Galaxies I was on, and every one of them was really impressed, and some of the fathers in that million audience who are out there who have lost sons have been watching these special orders, calling my office, and this will touch them because here is a father whose son is with an engineering unit, and he does not want to lose him, and I had some of the young engineers I was taking back for a second time from the 43d Engineer Group down at Fort Benning that said there was one day they were out there and the U.N. troops supporting them disappeared. I do not want to say which country because maybe they are out there with different orders, and they looked around, and all of the sudden it seems very lonely. They are open and big construction equipment. They got their M-16's over there, and suddenly they are looking around and they are all alone. This is way out on the road to Balboa.

So here is what he says to Congressman HOKE. Now the date is significant: September 24 being the day before the first Black Hawk crash, the utility one, UH-60, where we lost three men, and the two warrant officer pilots are in the burn center down at Brooks Air Force Base down in San Antonio. Hopefully, they are going to be released soon back to Fort Campbell. This is one that went down at 1:30 in the morning where we got a paralegal guy, a hero with an arm and a leg lost. He says:

"Dear Congressman HOKE, this is to inform you about the situation in Somalia. My son," I will leave his name out, "is a platoon leader in the 568 Engineer Company, combat support in

Mogadishu and has informed me about his unit involvement. I'm disturbed about what appears to be a deteriorating situation in spite of the claims to the contrary by U.S. Special Envoy Adm. Jonathan Howe. My understanding of the situation is from two tours in Vietnam in Special Forces and combat units and over here as an instructor on counter guerrilla operations at the United States Army Infantry School, Fort Benning, GA. I was a professional Army officer until retirement in 1971," and he is the president of a Cleveland company that is into heavy wall steel casings, rail joints, track work, steel fabrications. So, he is in his second or third career in his life.

"In Somalia there are several key indicators of a heightened risk and even impending disaster. At this point there were only four killed in action, MP's on that Humvee accident August 8." Now we are at 26, and the four are from before, two under Bush and then five noncombat deaths. We are up to 35, and, when he is talking, only four since the four way back in the winter.

He says, "Popular support is on the side of Aideed. The Pakistanis have particularly earned the enmity of the populace, and the polyglot U.N. forces are regarded as foreigners. The average Somali has to side with his countrymen if he expects to be alive the day after the U.N. forces depart," and now we have got a U.S. date certain, March 31.

"Two, the gangs have sanctuaries that the U.N. forces do not have the power to control. There are entire sections of Mogadishu that are still under gang dominance.

"Three, the gangs have freedom of movement to attack U.N. forces at will because of the characteristics of the city," and I have seen that bird's eye view and help from the populace.

□ 2250

Additionally, practically every street is an ambush site, resulting from the narrowness of most streets and walls next to the streets.

What I have not seen, DUNCAN, were machinegun nests of the enemy forces with our sandbags on the roof of every third building. I never picked that up in looking at satellite imagery. And I sent three rolls of film in today with a 70-millimeter zoom from a few hundred feet up, and I will have clearer stuff than any intelligence people have shown me around here in 2 years.

He says every street is an ambush site. Conventional forces are exceedingly vulnerable in these circumstances, even if they are armed. My son and four of his soldiers luckily survived an ambush on June 5.

That is the same day they killed 24 Pakistanis.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will yield, that is why we needed to have some armor over there. You cannot work cities without having armor.

Mr. DORNAN. He wrote this the day after the armor was rejected the first time in the Pentagon by civilians without him knowing it.

Mr. HUNTER. The interesting thing here, too, is that we did not ask the Secretary of Defense to make his own analysis or to understand by his own background that you needed armor. All we needed him to do was to honor the request of his field commander.

Mr. DORNAN. Exactly. I do not know if you have seen this yet, but here is Clinton's report, the October 15 report that we asked for. And in it it has the armor, here it is right here, report to the Congress on United States policy in Somalia, October 13, 2 days early. A big long letter from Bill, signed in the White House.

When you turn to the disposition of all of our troops, and, by gosh, we have got a lot of stuff there, support stuff, when it comes to the quick reaction force comprised of 1,358 personnel, here is how they list it. This is already in print from the White House.

A brigade level headquarters of the 10th Mountain Division, a helicopter force of 48 aircraft, a battalion of the 10th Mountain Division with an engineering platoon, military police platoon, psychological operations team, civil affairs team, a truck section, a bulldozer team, and a special forces team. Then he says 46 forward support battalion with a platoon of MP's, a mechanized infantry team of 14 Bradley fighting vehicles and four tanks, and then he goes on the Rangers.

In other words, it is all in print, like there is nothing wrong with having four tanks and Bradleys here.

And when our pal Les Aspin says we didn't want to look offensive, there is not a media person with the skill to question this and not accept the answer, oh, we always have a few tanks, organic, to any U.S. division or battalion thereof.

No one would have noticed, particularly not with the Indians, with a whole potful of Russian T-72's, and I saw other countries with every type of German built, tired and tracked vehicle, all over the city.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman would yield, even if they did know this, who cares?

Mr. DORNAN. Exactly.

Mr. HUNTER. We had American forces over there that were military forces, and we made it a point that they were military forces. And what is more important, protecting those forces, or appearing to not be cosmetically offensive to some undefined international audience?

Mr. DORNAN. Who would have noticed?

Mr. HUNTER. Who are we catering to? That is the genesis or that is the exact description of what we did during Vietnam, where Washington, DC made political decisions and deferred re-

quests by commanders in the field, because they did not want to irritate politicians. And as a result of that, we lost many, many lives, because we did not honor the requests of field commanders.

All of you have to do when you have the best team in the world, when you have got Babe Ruth and Lou Gehrig in the lineup, all you have to do is be sober enough to get to the ball field. And our Pentagon apparently could not get to the ball field. At least they could not bring themselves to send the armor.

Mr. DORNAN. Well, here was another excuse. That some unnamed journalist or reporter was going to demand to know why four tanks and a handful of Bradleys were becoming organic to the 10th Mountain Division Quick Reaction Force. And then they said the people in Congress would find it offensive.

Who? JACK MURTHA, who went over there last week, a week before me, is the reason I guess I got to go, because a Democrat had gone. JACK is a former Marine, ran the press briefing center in Da Nang at the height of the Vietnam War. He is going to tell his colleagues, hey, we got a tough situation there. Alley ways, guys being sniped at, umpteenth soldiers dead throughout the U.N. command. They need a few armor vehicles.

Well, let me finish this dad's letter, and then we will read some of these names, because this sets it up.

He mentions the 4 soldiers, 4, now 30, but the 4 that were wounded June 5. He says wounded, they were actually killed.

He says we are very lucky that the casualty numbers are not significantly greater. All the U.S. casualties are support.

Well, that is true. There were only MP's up until then.

Four, the gangs are better armed. They are using rocket-propelled grenades with impunity to attack the U.S. compounds, even held a U.S. tanker in the harbor on Saturday. They are also improving their military skills, such as marksmanship, tactics, and coordination.

The day after this father wrote this letter, the first chopper went down on the night of September 25.

The situation is rapidly developing into urban guerrilla warfare against the U.N. forces. U.S. forces in this situation are increasingly vulnerable.

He goes on to talk about the thin-skinned vehicles of the combat support and service units. That 15 percent of the troops are female. One trucking company commander is female.

I met the company commander—captain, female, of one of signal units going in from Cairo West.

He points out the bulldozers, the loaders, the scrapers and the like, only the operators are U.S. Army soldiers, and all they carry are M-16's. They

have no heavy weapons. This is his son's unit. No mortars, no 50-caliber machine guns, no night vision devices, no TOW missiles, and, of course, no combat engineer vehicles, CEV's. For the combat engineer missions which they now perform exclusively in any engagement with the gangs, our men are outgunned at the outset.

United States security is unreliable. One unit was on a large search mission in support of the Pakistanis. In the afternoon, the Pakistanis disappeared, leaving our engineers naked without security. This is not a confidence builder. Army doctrine and practice until now have proscribed operations combining multilingual units below battalion level because of operating difficulties.

We learned this 50 years ago this month with the Brazilians in Italy. Good fighters, but they had to answer only to themselves.

There are increasing rocket and sniper attacks on our compounds. The RPG's are very effective antipersonnel weapons and they act like mortars in this application.

I learned all this on the site yesterday.

Our units are especially vulnerable to this type of attack. Car bombs and ground assaults will follow. The U.S. combat unit in the area is a brigade from the 10th Mountain, part of the quick reaction force, not used to secure any missions by the engineers or the transportation units. Please note it is light infantry.

And he points out there are no tanks with him at this point or APC's.

He closes—it is clear that the current forces on the ground are increasingly losing control. It is an obvious lack of combat power defined by quality of forces, communications, mobility, and firepower. A combat ratio of 3 to 1 is usually required for a conventional force to defeat another conventional force. A combat power ratio of at least 10 to 1 is needed for a conventional force to defeat a guerrilla force.

That is, if the politicians stay out of it, as did not happen in Vietnam.

The threat of another Beirut, a real disaster. We must decide to control the situation by reinserting significant numbers of U.S. forces. It took 19 months to accomplish that.

In order to maintain control, these forces may be required to stay there for years. Overwhelming force was a key success in Desert Storm. The other alternative is to leave. We must decide to do one or the other. We should not leave any of our forces out on a limb with inadequate security. Casualties will continue to mount. Not one single American soldier's life should be wasted on a situation that has no real mission or any linkage to our national interest.

Congressman HOKE, I look forward to your response. Very truly yours, Wil-

liam H. Willoughby, president. And the father predicted it all. And here comes the names of the young men who paid because people like this decorated special forces officer from Vietnam were not being listened to.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Let me just read, BOB, the names of the people who were killed in action. Lawrence L. Freeman, age 51, Fayetteville, NC. He was a U.S. Government civilian. He was killed when his truck hit a land mine near Bardera.

Mr. DORNAN. Former enlisted man doing intelligence work. Top-notch guy, one 51 years of age, our oldest fatality.

Mr. HUNTER. Pfc. Domingo Arroyo, U.S. Marine Corps, age 21, Elizabeth, NJ, 3d Battalion, 11th Marine Regiment, based in Twentynine Palms, CA.

Lance Cpl. Anthony D. Botello, U.S. Marine Corps, age 21, Wilberton, OK, C Company, 1st Battalion, 7th Marine Regiment, Twentynine Palms, CA.

□ 2300

Mr. DORNAN. Give the date he was killed.

Mr. HUNTER. 27 January 1993.

Mr. DORNAN. Sniper.

Mr. HUNTER. Sfc. Robert H. Deeks, U.S. Army, age 40, Littleton, CO, Company A, Second Battalion, 5th Special Forces Group, Fort Campbell, KY, killed 3 March 1993.

Mr. DORNAN. Land mine.

Mr. HUNTER. Sp. Mark E. Gutting, U.S. Army, 25 years old, Grand Rapids, MI, 977th MP Company, Fort Riley, KS.

Mr. DORNAN. He and the next three are the August 8 Humvee and the broken charred vehicle still lying there on the street.

Mr. HUNTER. That was destroyed by a command-detonated land mine.

Mr. DORNAN. By the way, the young gunner on the helicopter I was on turned around to me and hit the mike button and said to me, "Congressman, we were the first air on the ground. I landed where those four big trucks are parked, and I ran over to the vehicle. We were the first ones there." And he said, "It was a sad thing to see our guys dead and dying like that." It still sits there.

Mr. HUNTER. Sgt. Christopher K. Hilgert, U.S. Army, 27, Bloomington, IN, 977th MP Company, Fort Riley, KS, 8 August 1993, same incident. Sp. Keith D. Pierson, U.S. Army, 25 years old, Tavares, FL, same company, 977th MP Company, Fort Riley, KS. And Sgt. Ronald N. Richerson, 24, Portage, IN, 300th MP Company, Fort Leonard Wood, MO. All those killed on that same detonation.

Pfc. Matthew K. Anderson, 21, Lucas, IA, Company B, 9th Battalion of the 101st Aviation Regiment, Fort Campbell. Sgt. Eugene Williams, 26 years old, Chicago, IL, Company B, 9th Battalion of the 101st Aviation Regiment, Fort Campbell.

Mr. DORNAN. The black sergeant, the pride of his family in Chicago. We are now up to the September 25 incident that happened the day after this letter was written by this experienced father. No remains whatever went back. That family just had a memorial ceremony.

Mr. HUNTER. Sgt. Ferdinand C. Richardson, 27, Summermead, CA, Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 2nd Attack Battalion, 25th Aviation Regiment.

Mr. DORNAN. He was bumming a ride in the helicopter as an extra gunner for the two guys from Fort Campbell. We did get his remains back, Sgt. Richardson, but 21-year-old Matt Anderson Williams, those are the first two Americans with no remains going all through Desert Storm and Desert Shield, all through Grenada, all through Panama. We have to go way back to Vietnam before we have no remains recovered whatsoever, except pilots lost at sea.

Mr. HUNTER. CWO Donovan L. Briley, 33, North Little Rock, AR, Company D, 1st Battalion, 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment, Fort Campbell, KY.

Mr. DORNAN. Let me say something about this handsome guy, Donovan Briley, 33, Little Rock, AR. Five or six men may have died just protecting his dead body in the cockpit. The commander of the Rangers, your old unit, the 75th, the 3d Battalion, Danny McKnight, was wounded on the scene and he called back and said, we are not leaving this dead pilot. We want his remains. We are going to stay here. You know why? Because they were worried about the incident on the 25th of September, having the crowd get the body, tear it apart and not have any remains. So to even protect a dead warrant officer pilot of the first chopper that went down, men gave their lives. And I had Admiral Jeremiah, our Deputy Chief of Staff, take exception to the questioning of one of our freshman Democrats that these men were not well armored. And he starts talking about this great Kevlar equipment. There was nobody that died that day of a body shot. That Kevlar armor is great. But they died of face shots, neck shots. And one man was hit with a rocket grenade of some kind that went up through his body, inside the armor, and his Kevlar stayed intact but his body was destroyed. So we were not talking about bulletproof vests of the highest state of the art. A fire fight is a fire fight, and they were fighting for their lives. Starting off to defend WO Donovan Briley.

Mr. HUNTER. Let me say something about the Rangers, too, I had the privilege of serving when the 173d Airborne came back from Vietnam in June or July 1971. I went to the Rangers for the remaining 4 months of my tour, Charlie Company Rangers, C Company Rangers in the highlands, in Nkai. But

I was compared to the people who were in these Ranger companies, which all of whom, the personnel are all Ranger-qualified, all jump-qualified. I was jump-qualified, but I did not go to Ranger School. Those people are highly trained, much more highly trained than the average Ranger who served in Vietnam. They are absolutely the cream of the crop. They have tremendous equipment, very sophisticated communication capability, and project American power more effectively and efficiently than any land forces have every projected power. So they are a very, very elite unit.

Cpl. James M. Cavaco, 26, Forestdale, MA, Company B, 3d Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment, Fort Benning, GA. Sp. Dominick M. Pilla, 21, Vineland, NJ, Company B, 3d Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment, Fort Benning, GA.

Sgt. Lorenzo M. Ruiz, 27, El Paso, TX, Company B, 3d Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment, Fort Benning, GA. Sp. James E. Smith, 21, Long Valley, NJ, Company B, 3d Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment, Fort Benning, GA.

As you go through these names and you look at the hometowns of these people, you realize that this is one of the few things that this country does all together. That is, defends the Nation's interests.

FURTHER DISCUSSION OF EVENTS IN SOMALIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of Ohio). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. I will try to give a little convenience to our wonderful staff folks who are here tonight. I will not speak for 60 minutes, but let me continue with the list of casualties.

Americans, if you look at the places that these Americans come from, many times when a young person joins the armed services, it is the first time he has moved from his hometown, whether it is Vineland, NJ, or Forestdale, MA, or El Paso, TX. And he finds out a little bit about the rest of the country. It is one of the best geography lessons that you can have in this country is to join the military and meet all these people and live with all these people from various parts of the United States.

Sp. James E. Smith, I think I mentioned him, 21 years old, Long Valley, NJ, Company B, 3d Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment, Fort Benning, M. Sgt. Timothy L. Martin, 38, Aurora Dearborn, U.S. Army Special Forces Command, Fort Bragg, NC.

Mr. DORNAN. This master sergeant, 38 years of age. Timothy Martin, and the next two are more trained, if it is humanly possible, than the four Rangers that you read before them. These are the top secret, most highly quali-

fied people. If you ever get hijacked on an airliner, it is a Sgt. Tim Martin that is coming to get you released and save your life.

Mr. HUNTER. You can tell that the young people that serve on our line units, for example, if you take the average Marine unit, the young people that serve in those units, the average age of the young person who serves on a U.S. aircraft carrier in the Navy is about 19 or 20 years old. When you see somebody who is a master sergeant, 38 years old, that truly in the military, although that would be young for us, in the military that is a real oldtimer. It is somebody who has a lot of experience and a lot of capability that hopefully will help him keep his unit, keep the personnel in his unit safe and secure in situations that are very dangerous.

SFC Earl R. Fillmore, Jr., 28, Blairsville, PA, U.S. Army Special Forces Command, Fort Bragg, NC. Staff Sgt. Daniel D. Busch, 25 years old, Portage, WI, U.S. Army Special Forces Command, Fort Bragg, NC. Sgt. James C. Joyce, 24, Denton, TX, 75th Ranger Regiment, Fort Benning, GA. and I believe I saw his father discussing the situation, if it was Colonel Joyce, I believe, a couple of nights ago on national television, and understanding what it means to put your military people in harms' way and understanding foreign policy in a way that many people who are presently leading the civilian sector of our military leadership do not understand.

□ 2310

If we took Colonel Joyce, I think, I believe he was a retired colonel, and took some of the top leaders in the Clinton administration out of their positions and put him in, the country would probably be better for it. He showed great common sense and understanding of military missions.

Pfc Richard W. Kowalewski, Jr., 20 years old, Crucible, PA, 75th Ranger Regiment, Fort Benning, GA.

Mr. DORNAN. Time magazine printed a series of excerpts from this proud young Ranger in last week's issue, and you could see him change in his letters just over a period of a couple of weeks, and anxiety developing over the type of operations they were going into and Aided's use of woman and children as shields.

The open segment from his letter, let me just read it here, because they are beautiful words. This is Private Kowalewski.

He writes: "August 11. I love my country and everything it stands for. I am in a position that I may have to give my life for my country. I must also say a few words for the 3rd Ranger Battalion. As you well know, I love this. Despite how we all fight and mess with one another, there is a bond here. You have to be part of it to understand.

I am very confident in the leadership of the 3d Ranger Battalion."

They put excerpts in from about seven more letters, really beautiful. On September 22d, that would be 11 days before he gives his life for his fellow soldiers, and for that downed helicopter crew, he says, "Men are said to have women and children holding hands walking in front of the gunmen as they shoot, sort of human shields. Don't get me wrong, but I am scared, real damn scared."

Two days later he says, "I am starting to get real homesick. The best news is, those last stories turned out to be a hoax."

His last entry says: "Yesterday was probably the coldest, darkest, saddest day of my life. I stood at attention as three American soldiers were rolled by in caskets draped with American flags." What he did not know was, two of those caskets were empty. That was Williams and Richardson, from the September 25th helicopter crash.

"War is very sad and kills everyone in some way. I cannot help but think, what if it had been me in one of those caskets."

The next day, September 27: "I am being as careful as I can. I carry a loaded weapon with me everywhere I go. I don't hesitate one bit showing it to the faces of these Somalis that are always around us." He was the youngest by far of the six Rangers who were killed and the five Special Ops guys from Fort Bragg.

Mr. HUNTER. PFC James H. Martin, Jr., 23, Collinsville, IL, 10th Mountain Division, Fort Drum, NY. He comes from Fort Drum, where our great friend, David O.B. Martin, our friend on the Committee on Armed Services, and now the gentleman from New York, JOHN MCHUGH, represents, and always did.

I remember both those Representatives always paid special attention to Fort Drum and the military construction projects there. They were very proud of their Mountain Division.

Mr. DORNAN. Here is a letter from his dad, cousin, to Clinton. He sent it to another one of our colleagues from Georgia. JOHN LINDER.

He says: "Unlike you, Mr. Clinton, the Martin family has paid for their American citizenship in service and blood. Eight uncles fought in World War II. Uncle Woody died in his chute with the 82nd Airborne over Arnhem. My wife's father and uncle, Roy and William Gilbert, were POWs. I thank God they were liberated, because you are now killing our remaining live POWs..."

Then he takes a shot at Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown. "Uncle Sherman got the Purple Heart with the 5th Marines in the Chosin Reservoir in Korea. Seven of my cousins and I served in Vietnam. Mike lost his right arm. Cousin Sandy served in Desert Storm, and is now in Somalia."

"Defining patriotism to you is like explaining Judaism to Hitler. From the abortion of young children to euthanasia of the elderly to your health care plan, life is secondary to your thirst for power."

He goes on to get real serious after that, so there are families, like you talked about, at the kitchen tables of America, that find this extra painful and difficult because of the Commander in Chief having dodged the draft three times in 1969.

Mr. HUNTER. I think we should go on and talk about those who were killed, but I think the gentleman makes a point, in that President Clinton spent a good part of this year, against the wishes of these young people, who over and over again, in surveys and in statements, and in thousands of letters, said, "Don't force us to live in close contact with homosexuals," not in a mean way, but because "It is not good for us, it is not comfortable for us. Please don't do it to us, Commander in Chief."

He spent three-quarters of this year shoving homosexuals down the throats of these young Americans in uniform, but he could not send them four tanks when they asked for it.

Mr. DORNAN. That came up at almost every stop along the route I raveled over the weekend.

Mr. HUNTER. CWO Clifton P. Wolcott, 36, Cuba, NY, 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment, Fort Campbell, KY.

Mr. DORNAN. He was the other pilot at the first crash site.

Mr. HUNTER. Sgt. Cornell L. Houston, 31, Compton, CA, Company C, 41st Engineer Battalion, Fort Drum, NY.

Sfc. Matthew L. Rierison, 33, Nevada, IA, Headquarters and Headquarters Company, U.S. Army Special Forces Command, Fort Bragg, NC.

Sergeant Thomas—

Mr. DORNAN. He was standing right in front of the Ranger headquarters, they called it Golden BB. The most unlucky shot by one of Aided's men landed right in front of 13 guys having a conversation. Twelve were wounded. They are all back in the country.

What is amazing, another mortar round, RPG, landed near that, and it did not go off. That one the Ranger asked if he could have, and the superiors cut it in half, took out all the explosive parts, and he went home on a plane with that, because his time was up. He has that mortar shell, and believe me, that will be on his mantel and passed down to his grandkids; landed about 3 feet away from him.

Mr. HUNTER. Sgt. Thomas J. Field, 25, of Lisbon, ME, Company D, 1st Battalion, 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment, Fort Campbell, KY.

MSgt. Gary I. Gordon, 33, of Lincoln, ME, Headquarters and Headquarters Company, U.S. Army Special Forces Command, Fort Bragg, NC.

Mr. DORNAN. Gary Gordon died trying to rescue Tom Field, the name you read off before. Field is one of the door gunners of Durant's Black Hawk.

Mr. HUNTER. I think it is appropriate to also list the non-battle deaths, because these young people went over to Somalia in battlefield conditions. Very often a large number of the people who are killed are killed driving trucks and otherwise engaged in hazardous duty; that while it is not directly related to combat, it is part of the operation. They are deserving, I think, of our recognition.

Specialist Edward J. Nicholson, 21, of Houston, TX, Company H, 159th Aviation Regiment, died as a result of injuries sustained in an accident in Mogadishu.

Mr. DORNAN. It is okay to say how he died, because his parents know. This speaks so well of our medical forces.

He had lost both of his legs in a shark attack. He was on a work assignment, working hard. I mentioned earlier, it looks like Laguna, the water is so inviting, and he and a friend went in. His friend got him up on the beach.

They not only stopped the bleeding and got him to a vehicle and to the hospital, but unfortunately, he had lost so much blood that he had oxygen starvation to his brain. However, they got him on an airplane and got him home and up here at Walter Reed. They flew his family to join him, and they were at his side when he died on October 6, in his beloved United States.

Mr. HUNTER. Private David J. Conner, U.S.A., age 19, Huntington Beach, CA, 57th Transportation Company, 10th Mountain Division, Fort Drum. He died in an automobile accident.

Mr. DORNAN. He was one of our Orange County, California guys driving a big five-ton truck with water, taking it out to the people, and the other engineer swerved to avoid a pothole and the whole load shifted. The truck overturned, and you are right, these guys, non-battle deaths, also die serving, trying to feed these starving people.

Mr. HUNTER. Private Don D. Robertson, U.S. Army, age 28, Tustin, CA, 157th Field Service Company, Fort Hood, TX. He died also in an automobile accident, driving a five-ton truck.

Mr. DORNAN. He swerved to avoid a pedestrian. Don was in the back and got thrown out of the truck, way out in the countryside in Baidoa, again trying to feed people.

This is what Christ talked about with the beatitudes: Blessed are the peacekeepers, for they shall know God. So he is part of that effort that started out so wonderfully over there.

Mr. HUNTER. Lance Corporal William A. Rose, U.S. Marine Corps, age 20, San Joaquin, CA, Company B, 1st Battalion, 7th Marine Regiment, Twentynine Palms, CA.

□ 2320

Private Daniel L. Harris, U.S. Army, age 21, Newsoms, VA, Headquarters Company, 13th Corps Support Command, Fort Hood, TX.

So that is the casualty list for the KIA, killed in action and non-battle death list. The country owes them all a debt of gratitude, and I think what we have to do her is to reassess. Americans make a lot of mistakes, and I think one of our greatest national assets is our capability to come back from mistakes, learn from them, and do the right thing.

I think that this Secretary of Defense, and I called for his resignation today even though he is a friend, and I think Les Aspin did some very valuable things at times as the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and he made some good political decisions. Unfortunately, in this decision not to send tanks when his field commander requested them, he made a political decision when it should not have been a political decision. It should have been a troop decision, and he should have sent the tanks, and in the words of my old platoon sergeant in Charlie Rangers, whom I just talked to a few moments ago, Pop Carter, the Secretary of Defense broke the contract.

Mr. DORNAN. DUNCAN, you know at the press conference this morning, I did not join you. And I know you will not mind my saying some good things about Les. He did support the Contra freedom fighters in Nicaragua. He did stand with Reagan to save the peacekeeper missiles that helped bring about the end of the cold war. He spoke effectively and stood shoulder to shoulder against the entire leadership of his party across the way, 177 votes, only three Republicans on this side, but not to drive Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait, 180 votes Les was with you, with me, with the prevailing majority against the 180.

The two reasons I gave, and I do not want to damn with faint praise, but I really do believe Les will never ever deny command forces in the field what they want to protect the young men and women who serve under them, and as Sir Arthur Wellesley said, you learn by your mistakes, and this is what I mean by damning with faint praise, I hope Les will not take this as an insult, but he was the best one on the list Clinton had. SAM NUNN was on the list for a while, both good guys on defense during that period. I am terrified if Les Aspin leaves that position that Clinton truly will find a person who was giving aid and comfort to the enemy during the Vietnam war, like Strobe Talbot, one of his Rhodes Scholar friends in England, who has now the most important ambassadorial job in the world for America. He is the Ambassador to Kazakhstan, Tadjikistan, Uzbekistan, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Moldova, Georgia, Azerbaijan. This

guy, Strobe Talbot, who lied for Clinton as a senior editor of Time Magazine is the Ambassador Plenipotentiary to all of the states of the former evil empire. That is who he would put in Les Aspin's position if Les, like a British Politician, resigned over this bad call.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will yield, although I have called for his resignation, and I wish I had had a chance to talk to Secretary Aspin today. I was in the room and my time was coming, and the hearing was concluded before I got a chance to look him in the eye and tell him this, so I sent a letter to him, and I hope to talk to him tomorrow. But nonetheless, I think the fact that I have called for his resignation, and several other Republicans have done that, it probably will not lead to his resignation. And I think I also agree with you that he has taken to heart the burden of what occurred the other day, because he did not give his field commander what he needed because of political considerations. And I hope that he never again fails, as Pop Carter said, to carry out the contract.

Mr. DORNAN. I do not think it will happen. And I saw it in his face, because he accompanied one of those civilians that gave him the bad advice, and our great Chief of Staff of the Army, Gordon Sullivan, to the first funeral at Arlington Cemetery of one of the names that you read, a beautiful Irish name, James Joyce, retired colonel, and Les was standing at the funeral, and I looked at the picture in Time magazine, and I could see the pain in his face.

Let us close on this. Tomorrow I will take another special order to discuss what Adm. Jonathan Howe told me and Maj. Gen. William Garrison told me, commander of all of the Rangers and other special ops. guys, and the 160th Tigers out of Black Hawk squadrons and the other exotic helicopters up at Fort Campbell, and what I learned from just men in the field and talking to the Rangers, and some more conversations about the guys that were in the firefight from hell. One thing I want to get on the RECORD tonight, General Garrison walked me out to the C-5 as we were leaving, and we had jammed for four hours on the ground, and I had answered every question that I asked. He took me by the arm and he said, "Congressman, may I tell you something." This guy is a terrific-looking specimen of a general officer. He said, "That was a good mission. We accomplished our mission on October 3. We captured 20 of these people that had been killing U.N. troops, their leadership. Four died in the firefight from their own fire mostly. We got them out of there, and we tried to defend our men that were trapped in that helicopter." And you will appreciate this being a paratrooper. He said, "Congressman, we just simply got ourselves

in a hell of a firefight, and we won that too." About 400 Somali learned that Americans know how to defend themselves, even when they are trapped, pinned down, and you are sniping them. And I said I understand that, General.

The attitude of the younger Rangers was let us get Aided.

Now Clinton showed his lack of experience again this morning at the press conference when he jerks out the Rangers, and then he says well, the Marines are trained to do that. Again, I repeat, young, brandnew Marines are good, and they will be marksmen, sharpshooters, and the handful of experts in there. But they are not of the caliber of these people who were learning the alleyways of this small Horn of Africa site.

Mr. HUNTER. I think the Rangers had some experience in becoming street smart.

Mr. DORNAN. Exactly. Again, I say if he wanted to pull them out, why would he tell Aided. Aided has been bragging all day long that he has driven out the best fighting force in the world, our U.S. Rangers, out of that fight.

When I was in the U.N. compound, and I will close on this, a guy taps one of my military aides, getting a little dramatic here, and he says, "The Congressman dropped this letter." And he said, "I think it's important to him."

Well, the colonel could see that I did not drop the letter, and he picked it up, and we got on the C-5, and we are climbing out of Ethiopia, heading back to Cairo West. And he said, Congressman, come here, and showed it to the highest-ranking officer on board. By the way, all of the aircrews on the C-5's are lieutenants and captains, unbelievable, flying this gigantic apartment building through the skies. And he showed me the letter. And it ties in to the special order I had last week.

It is dated September 14, again, a week before the person that this letter is addressed to was captured. Now, I go back through all of the computer files and I find out that this key, No. 1 lieutenant, aide and financier of Aided, the killer, was captured April 14, and we let him go. He was captured again September 21, and I guess this letter was on his person. And some of the people there did not want to hand it to me for fear that they would be picking a battle with the media. So they pretended that it was dropped on the ground, and I had dropped it.

It says, Dear Osman, and you see his name in the April 14 story as Osman Otto, O-t-t-o. But I have learned through intelligence that it is Atto, A-t-t-o, Osman, Aided's key guy. This is the week before he has been captured, signed by four British journalists, or three Brits and one Canadian.

Mr. HUNTER. Let's set this up. These are journalists who want to get some good footage.

Mr. DORNAN. Good footage. I do not know if that was their only motivation, but you be the judge. If that was their only motivation, it would have been all right.

Mr. HUNTER. But the bottom line was they wanted a story. That is the point. They were not concerned necessarily about the morality of the situation or whether it was good or bad.

Mr. DORNAN. Or our fighting men or any of the other forces.

Mr. HUNTER. They simply wanted a story, so go ahead and read it. I think it will be interesting.

Mr. DORNAN. These are from respectable papers, such as the Times in London. Let me jump ahead. One of these people, Mark Hubayan, was allowed into interview Durant when Durant gave his first interview and asked for the pizza, and started to cry when he talked about all of the men on his crew, and the two Rangers that came to save him were great, great Americans he said, and he started to cry. And you could tell he was in a lot of pain, and had been turning down pain medication. It says, "Dear Osman, once again we would like to seek your help in getting an interview with General Aided. UNOSOM is under great political pressure to change its policy in Mogadishu."

I have to remind you again this is September 14, 11 days before the first chopper went down at night, 2 weeks before the October 3d firefight where we lost 18.

The humanitarian section at the U.N. is calling for a political solution, and Animal Howe has been called to New York to discuss this.

Now, the officers and I on the C-5 looked at the handwritten note that this is typed from, and it is terribly spelled, and there is no "d." We decided it might have been Admiral Howe, just all of the letters reversed around, but it sure looked like "Animal Howe."

□ 2330

I want to give these reporters the benefit of the doubt on that. Now, underlined is the time for the general to speak to us and to make his point to the media. We can bring a camera to videotape the interviews for the television stations. Above all, please recognize that the timing for now is perfect. It would allow General Aided to take the political initiative. He already has the military initiative. With best wishes, Sam Kiley of the Times, Mark Huband, Guardian; Scott Peterson, Telegraph, three of them signed it. The last one is Paul Watson, the Star.

That must mean Paul Watson of the Toronto Star, the guy that my daughter Robin called me about last week when I was on the floor because she had just seen him with Bernie Shaw on CNN saying that we were a little too obsessed with all these American casualties, bodies being dragged through

the streets, desecrated and beaten. He said, "I have seen the Somalia children in the hospitals." Yes, the one that Aideed uses as human shields.

My daughter said—now I did not use Bernie's name last week, but I am going to call him now that I have this letter. Bernie said, "You mean we are too interested in the Americans and not the Somali casualties?" I hope Bernie was not really thinking that through when he asked this, and get this—

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will allow me, let us make this clear. What the gentleman has there is something that I think is the darker side of international journalism. The point is that American kids are being killed by this man, and yet the journalists, these international journalists are writing this killer and acting like his public relations agent. They are saying, "Now is the chance for you and General Aideed to tell your side of the story and win some brownie points in the public relations game, and we will help you if you will just give us a little time on camera. It is good for us. It is good for you." That is the dark side of journalism.

Mr. DORNAN. Well, it almost smacks—I hope I am wrong—it almost smacks of the bias of media in Vietnam glorifying Ho Chi Minh, another Aideed-type person; no regard for human life. His own young teenagers, subteens, women or fighting men, no regard, because he can always replenish them from his clan out in the boon-docks.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will allow, there was a tinge of that in the Desert Storm operation. I remember when General Schwarzkopf began to have his great successes against Saddam Hussein, was not just playing "rope-a-dope" as if he was Muhammad Ali, going to come back, the wiley fighter, and he was going to end up killing a lot of Americans. As if this was a game and he was the underdog and they were rooting for him. Actually, the lives of hundreds of thousands of young Americans depended on him not being able to come back, not being able to beat the American forces. It was a little bit—you know what is interesting: I walked in and my family were watching television one night and I did not realize that it was Saturday Night Live. Even Saturday Night Live, this comedy show, caught this fact and they had a press conference—obviously a mock press conference, but I had just walked in and did not realize that—you had the American general briefing the press, saying, "We can't give out any secrets here and we don't want to say anything that would be bad for morale, so please understand that and limit your questions." And the first question was, "What do you think would be the most demoralizing thing for the American troops?" And he said, "No, please,

we can't do that." Somebody else raises their hand and they say, "What are the passwords up at the front?" And he said, "We can't do that." Finally, though, you have a guy in an Arab headdress who said, "Where are your men? Can I count them?" And then they said, "It is Saturday Night Live."

Mr. DORNAN. Also, where will they be landing? Where will the war start, and when will you attack, at what point?

Mr. HUNTER. I realized at that point that even a television show which could never be characterized as a conservative show—

Mr. DORNAN. Never.

Mr. HUNTER. Was picking up the fact that there was a certain antagonism by the press, including some of our press, toward the prospect of a military victory by the American military. There was a certain amount of antagonism in Desert Storm toward our military. They did not rail, they were not pleased with the fact that we had low casualties if they did not get to cover certain beats and if they did not get to be allowed to go to certain areas. The most important thing for them was not American success, it was what kind of footage they got. In those terms, if you are the cameraman who gets the footage of the American being stripped naked and being dragged through the streets and mutilated, perhaps the war had been more successful for you than if you were simply an American journalist who gets briefed on an American victory, as they did in Desert Storm.

Mr. DORNAN. Without knowing it, the gentleman has led me to my point. In those three magazines last week that all had Durant on the cover, which I held up—and here is where my former broadcasting days get to me with these cameras because I would like to call for a closeup. This is a U.S. News & World Report. Here is a full two-page spread picture of the trousers of probably Jimmy Martin, Jr. because that is not a Ranger outfit, that is the khakis of the 10th Mountain Division. You can tell by the 5-ton truck exploded in the background that this was at the front of the column of the rescue unit trying to come up from Circle K-4 from the southwest to get to the Ranger positions up on top of this hill by the Olympic Hotel. I look at this picture and looked up at the corner, and it says "AFP," Agence France Presse. When I went through Time magazine on the airplane coming home, 3,300 angels above the Atlantic somewhere, I picked this article up and here is the same picture with a different Somali, a two-page picture of Jim's trousers, and I look at this picture and I look at the trousers, and I look to see who took this one. I could not believe my eyes. Read what it says on the side of this picture. Here it is at the beginning of

this Time magazine with the same person in U.S. News holding up a bloody teeshirt, a white jockey shorts covered with blood, one of our 10th Mountain Troopers. Read whose name is on the side, whose picture that is, this tiny, miniscule print, the photo credit. You have to turn it sideways.

Mr. HUNTER. Paul Watson, Toronto Star.

Mr. DORNAN. Now, unless Paul Watson is a man of color, that means this Canadian Caucasian journalist is in these angry streets with these people who have torn apart—killed POW's, torn apart their bodies, and he is allowed to move around and take these photographs of this mayhem?

Today in the Washington Post is the story of another father who is the president and CEO of a computer company in Nairobi, one of our American businessmen overseas. He says, "My son is a photojournalist who was beaten to death by a mob on July 12," and he is indicating that one of these helicopters was overhead and was calling back to the base. He has gotten some records. They could have landed and helped his son. But then the pilots might have been overrun and killed.

He said, "My son was asked by Aideed with three other journalists to come in and photograph the results of the U.N. operation where Aideed said his people were hurt." These four journalists were beaten to death July 12. I did not even know about this story. In an incident like that, why can Paul Watson move through these streets and photograph the desecration of the remains of our murdered Americans, many of whom were prisoners and alive, and then come on with Bernie Shaw, my friend at CNN, and say that we are too interested in the American casualties, we ought to know more about the Somali casualties in their hospitals. Very interesting. I look forward—I asked for Paul Watson when I was there, but I did not get to find him because he is out in the city, I guess, in Mogadishu.

Final thought, small area, real small; looks like an Army graphic demonstration of a city with guerilla warfare out at the National Training Center in Barstow. I could not believe that we had not gotten the proper equipment in there to back up and defend these men who were trying to arrest the man you properly called this morning a war criminal. Tomorrow I will be back and talk more about the diplomatic ramifications of the U.N. and how we can extricate ourselves from this and how it has probably saved American lives that would have died in Haiti or Bosnia were it not for the loss of our 18 heroes on October 3 and October 4, the three chopper crewmen on the 25th of September, and the one senior sergeant who died of a mortar round right behind the sandbags at the very entrance of the Ranger and Special Forces living

area there at the International Airport.

□ 2340

Mr. HUNTER. I want to thank the gentleman for all the time he has taken and for that 40-hour plane trip.

Mr. DORNAN. I loved it.

Clinton appointed Jane Fonda as a representative to the United Nations, Hanoi Jane.

One of the soldiers asked me about this. I had heard of her speaking out there, but I did not know why. One of the Catholic kids over there was talking to me about Rush Limbaugh and he said, "Did you know about her speech at the U.N. attacking the Catholic Church?"

You know what I told this sergeant? "You must be wrong. She would not have done that. Clinton went to Georgetown, a Jesuit University. He would not have sent her up to do that."

I am on the airplane and just to get a break from all this military reading, I pick up a conservative Catholic paper, the *Wanderer*, and my eye goes to a story on Solzhenitsyn. I read all about the honors he received in Luxembourg. I read an article on encyclical morals to be presented October 5, which I have not had the delightful honor of reading in our society as it morally decays, and Jane Fonda's name catches my eye in the corner. Here is an article by Henry King. Listen to what Clinton did to these military people with Hanoi Jane, who sat in the gun pit, and Ted Turner was with her on this trip to the U.N., and we will close on this:

New York. Jane Fonda, left-wing political activist and physical fitness queen, became the first outfront Catholic basher since Dr. Jocelyn Elders won U.S. confirmation for Surgeon General by a wide margin.

Dr. Elders had been described as an anti-Catholic bigot, although 14 out of 15 Catholic Democrats in the Senate voted for her. Fonda in her role as President Clinton's special goodwill ambassador to the United Nations International Conference on Population and Development hammered the Catholic Church before a crowded United Nations assembly on September 20, stating that—

And I am quoting Fonda with Ted Turner in the wings—

Powerful vested interests, including the Catholic Church want us to ignore contraception as a necessary part of family planning.

The 56-year old Fonda, nicknamed Hanoi Jane after she visited enemy North Vietnam leaders in Hanoi as a friend of the court at the height of the Vietnam War also hit the church which she described as 'the church's reluctance to face reality.'

Then she goes on to ridicule the church about Galileo and it says:

Fonda continues an assertion that a population explosion is producing more people than the earth can feed.

And this writer feels that this type of latent Catholic bashing which we would never tolerate, hitting Jewish

Americans, was made easy and politically correct by Dr. Elder's easy 65 to 34 Senate confirmation only two weeks earlier.

And the response to Fonda, who was accompanied by her millionaire media executive husband, was answered by Monsignor John K. Woolsey, who is a friend of mine, Director of New York Archdiocese Family Life Office, and here is a good shot across her bow:

Now we have the gospel according to Jane Fonda. She has come a long way since Barbarella. I was wondering how long it would take Hanoi Jane to come up with another politically correct cause. Before she attacks the Roman Catholic Church, may I suggest that she take the time to learn and understand the rich and beautiful teaching of the church regarding the sacredness and dignity of human sexuality.

Thank you, my good friend and highly trained theologian, Monsignor John Woolsey.

I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], the beat goes on. Clinton sends Jane Fonda to the U.N. and pulls the U.S. Rangers out of Mogadishu before they can avenge the death of all their comrades and put brand new young Marines, 3,600 of them under what—what does Montgomery say in the same press release on the wires today where Clinton is making these ignorant statements? He said:

Well, nobody has put the Marines under my command yet.

He answers to a Turkish three-star general, Lieutenant General Cevik Bir who I had lunch with, a good man, but uncomfortable about our troops under him. He could not get the backup, either, and General Tom Montgomery says:

I guess some of these Marines will be coming ashore.

Clinton's disastrous followup foreign policy, and what you and I warned about, standing there and here in September and October has come home in spades. The man is incapable of understanding the military culture or making decisions that respect what our men and women are doing in the field, offering their lives not only for their country, but for humanitarian peace-keeping missions.

Mr. HUNTER. Nonetheless, my friend, as we close this special order, we have one Commander in Chief, and that is Bill Clinton, and we have one Secretary of Defense. I do not think he is going to be resigning at my call, and that is Les Aspin. Let us hope for the sake of our country and the safety of our young people that they have learned some lessons here and that they discover competency in foreign policy.

Mr. DORNAN. If they have not, it is going to be a long, long 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following notes on my trip to Somalia:

WHAT BOB HOPES TO ACCOMPLISH ON HIS TRIP TO SOMALIA

(1) Personally view "air bridge" options by U.S. Air Force to resupply forces in Somalia.

Find out crew stress on these long flights and need for C-17 type aircraft on Third World airfields.

(2) Ground commander report on situation in Somalia including:

a. Specific military objectives.

b. Threat identification/rules of engagement.

c. Command and control relationships with both Washington, D.C. and U.N. forces.

d. Precise security arrangements for U.S. forces both on patrol and within the rear area of operations.

(3) Gain first hand knowledge of the morale of U.S. troops and living conditions of these troops.

(4) Gain knowledge of Somali support/opposition to U.S. presence.

(5) Show active public/Congressional support for U.S. troops.

(6) Determine need for additional forces including specific type of forces (armor, attack helicopters, engineer vehicles, etc.)

(7) Determine proper conditions for withdrawal of forces.

(8) Determine why requests for additional armor forces were denied and what can be done to prevent the problem in the future.

(9) Ask troops if they understand why they are in Somalia.

(10) Determine what else can be done to better support troops.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ENGEL (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EWING) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BOEHNER, for 60 minutes, on November 3 and 4.

Mr. BOEHLERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELDON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DORNAN, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SKELTON, for 5 minutes, on October 19 and 20.

Mr. EDWARDS of California, for 5 minutes, on October 25.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, on October 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RICHARDSON, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EWING) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MOORHEAD.
Mr. SOLOMON in two instances.
Mr. MYERS of Indiana.
Mr. LEWIS of California.
Mr. KNOLLENBERG.
Mr. CLINGER.
Mr. EMERSON.
Mr. RIDGE.
Mr. DICKEY.
Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
Mr. PORTMAN.
Mr. GILMAN in two instances.
Mr. CLAY.
Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WYNN.
Ms. BYRNE.
Mr. BROWN of California.
Mr. REED.
Mr. TORRES.
Mr. SARPALIUS.
Mr. PASTOR.
Mr. CLAY.
Mr. STUDDS.
Mr. DURBIN.
Ms. ESHOO.
Mr. SYNAR.
Mr. MINETA.
Mr. MEEHAN.
Mr. LEHMAN.
Mr. NADLER.
Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DORNAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GILLMOR.
Mr. WASHINGTON.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2446. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2518. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3123. An act to improve the electric and telephone loan programs carried out under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 111. Joint resolution designating October 21, 1993, as "National Biomedical Research Day."

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions

of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1487. An act entitled the "Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1993."

S. 1548. An act to amend the National Wool Act of 1954 to reduce the subsidies that wool and mohair producers receive for the 1994 and 1995 marketing years and to eliminate the wool and mohair programs for the 1996 and subsequent marketing years, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 21. Joint resolution designating the week beginning September 19, 1994 as "National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week."

S.J. Res. 78. Joint resolution designating the beach at 53 degrees 53'51"N, 166 degrees 34'15"W to 53 degrees 53'48"N, 166 degrees 34'21"W on Hog Island, which lies in the Northeast Bay of Unalaska, Alaska as "Arkansas Beach" in commemoration of the 206th regiment of the National Guard, who served during the Japanese attack on Dutch Harbor, Unalaska on June 3 and 4, 1942.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On October 15, 1993:

H.R. 2517. An act to enable the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to demonstrate innovative strategies for assisting homeless individuals, to develop the capacity of community development corporations and community housing development organizations to undertake community development and affordable housing projects and programs, to encourage pension fund investment in affordable housing, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 265. Joint resolution to designate October 19, 1993, as "National Mammography Day."

H.J. Res. 218. Joint resolution designating October 16, 1993, and October 16, 1994, each as "World Food Day."

H.R. 2399. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of land claims of the Catawba Tribe of Indians in the State of South Carolina and the restoration of the Federal trust relationship with the tribe, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2493. Joint resolution making appropriations for Agriculture, rural development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 20, 1993, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2026. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize a retroactive waiver of the survivability testing procedures that apply to the F-22 program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2027. A letter from the Board of Directors, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to the Republic of the Philippines, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

2028. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-121, "Real Property Tax Rates for Tax Year 1994 and Real Property Tax Classification Amendment Act of 1993," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2029. A letter from the Secretary, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of the surveyor's plat to accompany Council Resolution 10-91, "Transfer of jurisdiction over Children's Island, S.O. 92-252, Resolution of 1993"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2030. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Education, transmitting Notice of Final Funding Priority—Program for Children and Youth with Serious Emotional Disturbance, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2031. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to the Coordination Council for North American Affairs (Transmittal No. 03-94), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2032. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization's proposed lease of defense articles to the Coordination Council for North American Affairs (Transmittal No. 02-94), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2033. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting President Clinton's determination that the Board of the International Fund is, as a whole, broadly representative of the interests of the communities in Ireland and Northern Ireland, and that disbursements from the International Fund are distributed in accordance with the principle of equality of opportunity and non-discrimination in employment, without regard to religious affiliation, and will address the needs of both communities in Northern Ireland, pursuant to Public Law 99-415, section 5(c) (100 Stat. 948); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2034. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the price and availability report for the quarter ending 30 September 1993, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2768; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2035. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the report of political contributions by Nicholas Andrew Rey, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Poland, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2036. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 1998 resulting from

passage of H.R. 38, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2037. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report on proposed refunds in excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2038. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary (Civil Works), Department of the Army, transmitting the 2d priority project list report prepared by the Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Task Force, pursuant to Public Law 101-646, section 303(a)(3) (104 Stat. 4779); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2039. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report on "Buoy Chain Procurement Practices"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2040. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Board's report, entitled "Whistleblowing in the Federal Government: An Update," pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1205(a)(3); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2041. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "U.S. Colonias Water Pollution Control Act"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

2042. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that DOD intends to sign agreements with a value up to \$70 million to assist the Republic of Kazakhstan in activities related to the elimination of strategic offensive arms, pursuant to Public Law 102-396, section 9110(a) (106 Stat. 1928); jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

2043. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting a report on the transfer of property to the Republic of Panama under the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977 and related agreements, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3784(b); jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2044. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 93-45: POW/MIA Military Drawdown for Laos; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GORDON: Committee on Rules.

House Resolution 279. Resolution relating to the consideration of amendments reported from conference in disagreement on the bill (H.R. 2520) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-301). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. GONZALEZ: Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1257. A bill to reconstitute the Federal Insurance Administration as an independent agency within the executive branch, provide for minimum standards applicable to foreign insurers and reinsurers providing insurance in the United States, make liquidity assistance available to well-capitalized insurance companies, and provide for public access to information regarding the availability of insurance, and for other purposes; with an amendment; referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce for a period ending not later than November 19, 1993, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee pursuant to clause 1(h), rule X (Rept. 103-302, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 3300. A bill to amend the act popularly known as the Sikes Act to enhance fish and wildlife conservation and natural resources management programs on military installations; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Ms. LOWEY, Ms. DeLAURO, and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 3301. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent persons who have committed domestic abuse from obtaining a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. SOLOMON):

H.R. 3302. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to modify the penalties for certain passport and visa related offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey:

H.R. 3303. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to prohibit the Department of the Navy from contracting for long-term scheduled ship maintenance work to be performed outside the United States unless a certification is made to Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COX (for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. GOSS, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. ZIMMER):

H.R. 3304. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to allow State disapproval of Federal offshore leasing decisions; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. YATES, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 3305. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to establish a Board of Visa Appeals within the Department of State to review decisions of consular officers concerning visa applications, revocations, and cancellations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

H.R. 3306. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to regulate the retail sale of nondeposit investment products by insured depository institutions to prevent customer confusion about the uninsured nature of the products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ:

H.R. 3307. A bill to prohibit any entity that receives Federal assistance from delaying or denying the placement of a child into foster care or for adoption based on any difference between the race, color, or national origin of the child and that of the prospective foster or adoptive parent or parents if a prospective parent of the same race, color, or national origin is not available; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 3308. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide housing benefits for the purchase of residential cooperative apartment units; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MINETA (for himself and Ms. DANNER):

H.R. 3309. A bill to terminate the effectiveness of certain amendments to the foreign repair station rules of the Federal Aviation Administration; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 3310. A bill to establish the Barbara McClintock Project to Cure AIDS; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 3311. A bill to establish the Professional Boxing Corporation, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Education and Labor.

By Mr. PICKETT:

H.R. 3312. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to revise a map relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROWLAND (for himself, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. STUMP, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. LINDER):

H.R. 3313. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve health care services of the Department of Veterans Affairs relating to women veterans, to extend and expand authority for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide priority health care to veterans who were exposed to ionizing radiation or to Agent Orange, to expand the scope of services that may be provided to veterans through Vet Centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Ms. FURSE):

H.R. 3314. A bill to provide for a review of all Federal programs that assess or mitigate the risks to women's health from environmental exposures, and for a study of the research needs of the Federal Government relating to such risks; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. WASHINGTON (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WATT, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. MFUME, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. NORTON, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WATERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. WYNN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. STARK, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mr. THOMPSON):

H.R. 3315. A bill to prevent crime and to reform the criminal justice system to make it more fair; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKEY:

H.R. 3316. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit contributions by nonparty multicandidate political committees; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROGERS:

H.R. 3317. A bill to prohibit the U.S. representative to the United Nations from voting to approve, expand, or extend any U.N. peacekeeping, peacemaking, or peace-enforcing operation unless the President notifies the Congress before that vote; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MINETA (for himself, Mr. NATCHER, and Mr. MCDADE):

H.J. Res. 279. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Manuel Luis Ibañez as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MINETA (for himself, Mr. NATCHER, and Mr. MCDADE):

H.J. Res. 280. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Frank Anderson Shrontz as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NADLER:

H. Con. Res. 167. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that any comprehensive health care reform legislation that is enacted should ensure that women receive appropriate breast and cervical cancer screenings and general gynecological care consistent with current medical standards; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H. Con. Res. 168. Concurrent resolution relating to the Republic of China on Taiwan's rejoining the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROEMER (for himself, Ms. DUNN, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. ALLARD, and Mr. FINGERHUT):

H. Res. 280. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that a schedule should be adopted to require three consecutive 5-day workweeks per month; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

250. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to enacting legislation to protect the eligibility of senior citizens in public and assisted housing; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 65: Mr. BAKER of California.
H.R. 302: Mr. DELLUMS.
H.R. 303: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 349: Mr. REED.
H.R. 439: Mr. MCHALE.
H.R. 466: Mr. JACOBS and Mr. SUNDQUIST.
H.R. 476: Mr. REED.
H.R. 520: Mr. MORAN and Mr. BISHOP.
H.R. 546: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Ms. FURSE, Mr. KINGSTON, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. YATES.
H.R. 760: Mr. KLEIN.
H.R. 784: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 796: Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. BROWN of California, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 911: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland and Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 962: Mr. WHEAT.

H.R. 1087: Mr. DE LA GARZA.

H.R. 1155: Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 1161: Mr. SCHAEFER.

H.R. 1172: Ms. BYRNE.

H.R. 1205: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 1383: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 1392: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine.

H.R. 1504: Mr. VISCLOSKEY and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 1552: Ms. SNOWE.

H.R. 1608: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. KIM, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCHALE, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. ROEMER, and Mr. SUNDQUIST.

H.R. 1627: Mr. QUINN, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. SANTORUM.

H.R. 1683: Mr. PETERSON of Florida.

H.R. 1709: Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KLUG, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1720: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 1747: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 1755: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 1793: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 1945: Ms. DUNN, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. McMILLAN, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2135: Ms. NORTON, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 2147: Ms. NORTON, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. STUDDS, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. KREIDLER.

H.R. 2221: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 2354: Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 2523: Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 2543: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. RAVENEL, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. LOWEY.

H.R. 2638: Ms. LOWEY and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2641: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 2735: Mr. BEILSON, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 2759: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 2788: Ms. NORTON and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 2790: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2831: Mr. BAKER of California.

H.R. 2834: Mr. BROWDER and Mr. COPPERSMITH.

H.R. 2846: Mr. KLUG, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. BARRETT, of Wisconsin, and Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 2884: Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 2939: Mr. WYNN and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 3017: Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 3030: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 3031: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

H.R. 3041: Ms. VELAZQUEZ and Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas.

H.R. 3077: Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 3087: Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, and Mr. BROWDER.

H.R. 3098: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BERMAN, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 3105: Mr. LEVY and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 3128: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. PENNY, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 3129: Mr. LEHMAN.

H.R. 3173: Mr. BLUTE and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 3182: Mr. FAWELL, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 3192: Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 3203: Mr. LEVY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 3283: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BALLENGER, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.J. Res. 79: Mr. COBLE, Ms. BYRNE, and Mr. DARDEN.

H.J. Res. 113: Mr. GORDON and Mr. HAYES.

H.J. Res. 159: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FALOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. FROST, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MACHTEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. MEEK, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NATCHER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REED, Mr. REGULA, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SKEEN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STARK, Mr. SYNAR, Mrs. THURMAN, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WATT, Mr. WISE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. MCDADE.

H.J. Res. 175: Mr. UNDERWOOD.
H.J. Res. 178: Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. MACHTEY, and Mr. TUCKER.
H.J. Res. 185: Mr. APPELGADE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FISH, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.J. Res. 212: Mr. FAWELL, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. GIBBONS, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.J. Res. 245: Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. KING, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. HALL of Texas.
H.J. Res. 248: Mr. CANADY.
H.J. Res. 264: Mr. YATES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MANTON, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.
H.J. Res. 274: Mr. WOLF, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mrs. MEEK.
H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H. Con. Res. 122: Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. ROYCE.
H. Con. Res. 159: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BATEMAN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. KING, and Mr. KYL.
H. Res. 38: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS
Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2501: Mr. ZIMMER.